

# The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 26, 1884.

## CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. JUSTICE PEARSON has for some time been very much exercised with reference to the large increase in the number of adjourned summonses set down to be heard before him in court. On the first day of the sittings, as reported elsewhere, the learned judge stated in court his intention to have those adjourned summonses which are really in effect actions, set down in the list of non-witness actions, and to direct the summonses under the 165th section of the Companies Act, 1862, to be put into the same list. Mr. Justice PEARSON is not the only judge of the Chancery Division who is burdened with adjourned summonses. Vice-Chancellor BACON has 34, Mr. Justice KAY 16, and Mr. Justice CHITTY 47; while Mr. Justice PEARSON has 85.

THE CAUSE LISTS for the Easter Sittings again show an increase of work before the Appeal Court as well as before two out of three Divisions of the High Court. In the Appeal Court the list contains 170 appeals from the Chancery Division, including Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty as well as Stannaries appeals, and the same number from the Queen's Bench Division; 16 from the Admiralty Division, set down to be heard with assessors, and 22 from bankruptcy decisions, making, with 5 standing for judgment, a total of 383. In the Hilary Sittings list the total was 375, and, a year ago, 261. In the Chancery Division we find 155 cases set down before Vice-Chancellor BACON, 134 before Mr. Justice KAY, 187 before Mr. Justice CHITTY, 134 before Mr. Justice NORTH, and 257 before Mr. Justice PEARSON, making a total of 867 causes as against 825 at the Hilary Sittings and 870 at the Easter Sittings last year. In the Queen's Bench Division there are 28 cases in the New Trial paper, 4 in the Special paper, 44 opposed motions, 28 cases in the Crown paper, and 2 in the Revenue paper. The causes for trial with juries number 461, and those without juries 484, thus making up a total of 1,051, as compared with 1,024 at the last sittings and 865 a year ago. There are, besides, 10 bankruptcy matters for hearing before Mr. Justice CAVE. In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division there are 54 cases in the probate cause list, 234 in the matrimonial cause list, besides 76 standing over, and there are 81 actions for trial in the admiralty cause list. These make up a total in this Division of 395, as against 411 in Hilary Sittings and 243 a year ago. The grand total of all the lists, including that of the Appeal Court, amounts to 2,706 cases. In Hilary last, the total number was 2,636 cases, and in Easter, 1883, 2,289.

THE ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE Bill, 1884, to which we recently referred, is attracting a good deal of attention in consequence of the provision it contains for increasing the fees of court beyond the increase recently made, and we print elsewhere some forcible objections to the Bill which have been circulated by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society. Previously to the promulgation of the new scale of fees, in the majority of instances, where the fee on the higher scale differed from that on the lower scale, the amount of the former was double that of the latter. The new scale abolished the difference, and almost, without exception, every item on the new list is of the same amount as the equivalent higher scale fee formerly exacted, and many new fees and percentages have been instituted. Practically, therefore, it may be estimated that, taking the average of all cases, the fees have been already largely increased; and in every case which would formerly have paid fees on the lower scale, the fees are more than doubled. The Bill recites that it has been estimated

that the general produce of the court fees fixed in pursuance of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, and other Acts authorizing the same will be sufficient, after payment of the net expenses of the courts and offices, to produce the annual sum of £17,500 which it is proposed shall be paid out of court fees by way of rent for the occupation of the Royal Courts of Justice. This, to anyone who has studied the accounts yearly issued of the receipts and expenditure of the High Court of Justice and Court of Appeal, must appear to be an extremely sanguine estimate. The more probable result will be that the present fees of court will prove to be insufficient to provide the expected amount; and in that case "the authorities having power to fix the court fees" are to take into consideration this fact, and if the difference averages over a course of three or five years £10,000, either of excess or deficiency, the court fees are to be reduced or increased as the authorities shall think necessary, so that a further increase of court fees may, probably, be looked for at the end of three or five years from the present time. And the fluctuation may not cease there; as the Bill is worded the increase may be made from time to time every three or five years until the balance is adjusted to the satisfaction of the Treasury, and the civil administration of justice becomes self-supporting. The power of taxing suitors to the extent here indicated left permanently in the hands of any body other than the Legislature, is capable of working injustice so obvious as to invite the opposition, not only of members of the legal profession; but of the public generally, who may possibly become suitors.

THE GENERAL SCOPE of the London Government Bill is to assimilate the government of London to the government of boroughs under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and, with this view, by far the greater part of that Act is, with slight modifications, incorporated in the Bill. But the differences between London government and ordinary municipal government will, if the Bill passes, be many and important. We have carefully compared the Bill with the Municipal Corporations Act, and find the main differences to be as follows:—First, there are to be no aldermen, whereas, under the Municipal Corporations Act, s. 14, there are aldermen in every town council, holding office for six years. Secondly, the elections of common councillors are to be triennial, whereas the elections of councillors under the Municipal Corporations Act are annual, although only one-third of their number go out in every year (section 13). Thirdly, the office of "district councillor" is entirely unknown to the boroughs under the Municipal Corporations Act. Fourthly, ministers of religion are to be eligible as common councillors, whereas they are expressly disqualified by section 12 of the Municipal Corporations Act. Fifthly, Bills in Parliament are to be promoted and opposed by the common council, without any such check as is provided by Lee-man's Act (35 & 36 Vict. c. 91). Sixthly, there is to be no such definite appointment of purposes to which the corporate funds are to be applicable as is provided by section 140 and schedule 5 of the Municipal Corporations Act. As we read clauses 20 and 21 of the Bill, the common council will have power to levy a rate for the public benefit of the citizens and the improvement of London, whereas it is only a surplus of a borough fund which, by section 143 of the Municipal Corporations Act, may be applied for the public benefit of the inhabitants and the improvement of the borough.

ENGLAND, as somebody has observed, is a strange country, and the Middle Ages die there very hard. Many venerable relics of antiquity still survive in our legal system against which, as we have often remarked, modern makers of statutes find frequent opportunities to run their heads. The Conveyancing Act is rather rich in such self-invited traps and pitfalls. We published last week

a note of a case (*In re Pilling's Trusts*, *supra*, p. 443) in which Mr. Justice PEARSON had to deal with one of those unforeseen questions which are so difficult to answer. A sole trustee having died intestate in 1882 seized in fee simple of land held by him in trust, an order was made to appoint new trustees and to vest the trust property in them. At that time administration had not been taken out to his estate, and the order, as drawn up by the registrar, directed that the land should vest in the new trustees "for the estate therein now vested in the heir-at-law" of the intestate. Afterwards administration was taken out; and the question was raised whether, notwithstanding the vesting order, the legal estate did not, by virtue of section 30 of the Conveyancing Act, vest in the administrator. Mr. Justice PEARSON, with great ingenuity, evaded giving a positive decision upon the question, by making an order in such a form as would suit either hypothesis. But he seems rather to have inclined towards the opinion that, during the interval between the death of the intestate and the grant of administration, the legal estate was vested in the heir-at-law. We must humbly confess that, to our apprehension, the language of the Act much better supports the view that during such interval the legal estate is in abeyance. The Act says that the inheritance shall "devolve to, and become vested in," the administrator, "in like manner as if the same were a chattel real vesting in" him. Now, there never was any objection in law to the abeyance of a chattel interest, and such an interest would clearly be in abeyance during the interval between the death and the grant of administration. There was, it is true, the strongest possible objection in the eye of the old law to any abeyance of the immediate freehold. But since these grounds of objection do not at the present day (as they at one time did) rest upon any foundation of practical utility, and since they are so obsolete that have apparently been forgotten by everyone of the many learned persons who were concerned in promoting the Conveyancing Act, 1881, we may feel some doubt whether they ought to have much weight with regard to a totally new case, to which they are not directly made applicable by the language of the Act.

DR. CAMERON has secured for Wednesday, the 30th of April next, the first place upon the Order Book of the House of Commons for the discussion of the second reading of his Bill "to provide for the regulation of cremation, and other modes of the disposal of the dead," so that a division upon the Bill may be expected to take place. The Bill assumes the legality of cremation, and the elaborate charge to the grand jury of Mr. Justice STEPHEN in *Reg. v. Price* (L. R. 12 Q. B. D. 247) shows that the assumption is correct, the only restriction being that the cremation must not be performed under such circumstances as to create a public nuisance. The regulation of the practice is proposed to be accomplished by the provision that "it shall not be lawful to burn a dead body, or dispose of it otherwise than by burial, until the death has been registered under the Registration Acts as amended" by the Bill, and "except in a place licensed for that purpose by the Secretary of State, and in accordance with regulations which shall, from time to time, be made by the Secretary of State." If the Bill be intended to make cremation more frequent, we think that it would have been better to legalize the practice in so many words, looking to the novelty of the points raised in *Reg. v. Price*. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful whether, under the Bill as now worded, the Home Secretary would be under any legal obligation to license crematories, or to make regulations for their management. It would be desirable, therefore, to frame, in a schedule to the Bill, a set of simple regulations, which might be altered from time to time by the Secretary of State, or other central authority. The Bill also provides that it shall be illegal to bury until the death has been registered, and that death is not to be registered without the production of a medical certificate of the cause of death, in the terms of the Registration Acts. Failing such a certificate the coroner is to hold an inquest upon the body, as in a case of sudden death.

A BAKER was recently indicted at the Boston Quarter Sessions for selling a loaf of bread adulterated with thirty-five grains of slum, and, upon conviction, sentenced to a month's imprisonment.

Proceedings by way of indictment for adulteration are very rare; but, that the offence is a common law misdemeanor is undoubtedly (see *R. v. Dixon*, 3 M. & S. 11), and the power of proceeding by indictment is expressly saved by section 28 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 63), and so is "any other remedy against any offender" under that Act. The adulterator of bread may, indeed, be proceeded against in any one of three ways. First, by indictment at common law, the punishment upon conviction being fine or imprisonment, or both, to an amount and extent in the absolute discretion of the court of trial. Secondly, by summary proceedings under the Bread Act of 1836 (6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 37). By this Act only bread "made of flour or meal, of wheat, barley, rye, oats, buckwheat, Indian corn, peas, beans, rice, or potatoes, and with any common salt, pure water, eggs, milk, barm, leaven, potato or other yeast" may be lawfully sold (section 2), and any baker or other person using any other mixture or ingredient whatsoever "shall, for every such offence, forfeit the sum of not more than £10, nor less than £5" (section 8). And, what is more, the same section provides that "it shall be lawful for" the convicting justices "to cause the offender's name, place of abode, and offence to be published in some newspaper which shall be printed or published in or near the city, county, borough, or place where the offence shall have been committed, and to defray the expense of publishing the same out of the money so to be forfeited." Thirdly, proceedings may be taken under the more modern Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, s. 6, "whereby no person shall sell, to the prejudice of the purchaser, any article of food which is not of the nature, substance, and quality of the article demanded by such purchaser, under a penalty not exceeding £20," but this statute, unlike the Bread Act of 1836, and the Adulteration Act of 1872 (which last Act it repeals) contains no provision for publication of the name of the culprit.

IN A CASE of *In re Wilkinson*, reported elsewhere, an attempt appears to have been made to obtain the reversal of the practice which prevailed under the former bankruptcy systems of, as a general rule, allowing the costs of a trustee, who is unsuccessful in litigation, not shown to be improper, out of the bankrupt's estate. The official receiver applied as trustee to Mr. Justice CAVE to set aside an assignment on the ground that it was a fraudulent preference, but the application was dismissed. The learned judge gave the official receiver his costs out of the estate; and he is reported to have remarked that "the official receiver was entitled to take the opinion of the court in certain matters, and he did not think that he ought, except in an extreme case, to be made personally liable for costs." That is, we presume, provided there is any estate of the bankrupt out of which his costs can be paid. The learned judge cannot, of course, have meant to upset the well-established rule that a trustee in bankruptcy who brings an action or takes proceedings before the Court of Bankruptcy in substitution for an action, is, as between the parties to the action, in the same position as to costs as any other litigant. "The reason," said MELLISH, L.J., in *Ex parte Angerstein* (22 W. R. 581), where it was urged that there was hardly any estate to pay the trustee's costs, "for ordering the trustee to pay costs is, that applications of this kind to the Court of Bankruptcy are substitutes for an action at law. In an action at law the trustee in bankruptcy would be liable for costs just as any other plaintiff. In the case where the trustee makes an application, he ought to be satisfied that he has good grounds for making it; if he is doubtful as to the result, before making it he should get an indemnity against costs from the creditors, if he knows there are no assets out of which he can be paid."

AN IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT in connection with the law of evidence was made by WATKIN WILLIAMS, J., on Wednesday last. That learned judge stated that, after consultation with many other judges, he had come to the conclusion that an unstamped document was, unless the unpaid duty and penalty should be paid, absolutely inadmissible in evidence for any purpose except in criminal proceedings. Such is, beyond doubt, the construction of sections 16 and 17 of the Stamp Act, 1870, section 16 setting forth the terms upon which the unpaid duty may be paid upon a document tendered in evidence being discovered



to be unstamped, and section 17 providing that, "save and except as aforesaid," no instrument "shall, except in criminal proceedings, be given in evidence, or admitted to be good, useful, or available in law or equity, unless it is duly stamped in accordance with the law in force at the time when it was first executed." Under prior Stamp Acts it had been frequently held that unstamped documents were available in evidence to prove fraud, or some other fact collateral to the issue. (See, for instance, *Coppock v. Bower*, 4 M. & W. 361; *Gregory v. Fraser*, 3 Camp. 454; *Holmes v. Sizemith*, 21 L. J. Ex. 312; *Haigh v. Brooks*, 10 Ad. & E. 309; *Matheson v. Ross*, 2 H. L. Cas. 286; *Rutty v. Benthall*, L. R. 2 C. P. 488, from which, and other cases, it appears that the court, prior at least to 1870, took a very liberal view of the expression, "fact collateral to the issue.") We are not aware of any reported case since 1870 bearing upon the point, except, perhaps, *In re Teignmouth, &c., Shipping Association* (L. R. 14 Eq. 148), but we have little doubt that the cases prior to that date created an impression that the very plain words of the statute were inadequate to remove.

"THE ATTENTION of the Board of Works," says a correspondent, "should be directed to the floor of the Central Hall of the Royal Courts of Justice. Cracks are beginning to appear in the tessellated pavement in every direction, showing a defect either in the pavement itself or in the mode of laying it. Moreover, in numerous places two or three tesserae together have altogether disappeared, indicating that at no distant period the traffic will develop an extensive break up of the floor."

THE ROOM set apart in the Royal Courts of Justice for a bar library, situate immediately over Appeal Court No. 1, is now completely fitted with shelves and furniture, and is ready for the reception of the books, when the benchers of the different inns of court provide them.

On Tuesday last Mr. Justice Pearson again referred to the block of adjourned summonses in his court, of which, he said, eighty-four had come into the paper since the 23rd of January. He said that the non-witness causes were also greatly in arrear, only one having been heard since Christmas. An unfair advantage was being taken of the new order as to "originating summonses," and numbers of cases came into the paper by way of originating summonses which were really actions, and so obtained a precedence to which they were not entitled. What he intended to do in future was this—he should have such of the adjourned summonses as were really actions placed in the list of non-witness actions, and should not allow them to have precedence over the regular cause list. The numerous summonses under section 165 of the Companies Act of 1862 he also intended to send into the non-witness list. Other summonses, such as those for directions as to the mode of trial of an action, he should direct his chief clerk to indorse as to be brought on upon motion day, and he should give distinct notice that all summonses so indorsed, if not brought on at the earliest moment—that is, on the first motion day after the indorsement—would be treated as abandoned motions. His lordship intimated that these rules would apply only to new summonses, and he said that, for the present, he should direct that the originating summonses which are already in the list of adjourned summonses should go to the bottom of the list.

Mr. Justice Field had before him on Tuesday a list of ten cases for trial, but at the sitting of the court seven were struck out in consequence of the absence of the parties. Mr. Justice Field complained that solicitors allowed cases to remain on the paper when they were really settled, instead of giving notice at the proper office of what had happened.

Vice-Chancellor Bacon on Tuesday postponed the further hearing of a case for a week, in consequence of an accident to Mr. Matthews, Q.C., who is retained in the case. The accident was the result of a horse bolting, but it was stated that the injuries were not of a serious character.

## CONCERNING ESCROWS.

WE all know that an escrow is an instrument delivered upon condition; an instrument which, if the condition is performed, becomes an effective instrument; but, if the condition is never performed, never becomes an effective instrument. But the conditions requisite to constitute an escrow are not so generally known. In several respects the doctrines on this subject, to be found in the old books, have been greatly modified by modern decisions, and as there is a lack in the text-books of exposition of the present law on the subject, we may, perhaps, afford our readers some assistance by a short review of it.

We may, first of all, consider the question to whom the escrow may be delivered. Coke lays it down (Co. Lit. 36a) that "if a man deliver a writing sealed to the party to whom it is made as an escrow, to be his deed upon certain conditions, this is an absolute delivery of the deed, being made to the party himself."

But it may be delivered to a stranger as an escrow." The first proposition was well supported by authority. There was a resolution to that effect in *Thoroughgood's case* (9 Co. R., at p. 187), and in *Whyddon's case* (Cro. Eliz. 520) it was decided that "the delivery of a deed cannot be averred to be to the party himself as an escrow"

(see also *Hawkshaw v. Gatchel*, Cro. Eliz. 635, *Williams v. Green*, *Ibid.* 884). The reason given for the doctrine is that "the law respects the delivery to the party himself, and rejects the words which will make the express delivery to the party upon the matter no delivery." Sheppard's Touchstone (pp. 58, 59) mis-states this doctrine, and lays it down that "the delivery of a deed as an escrow is where one doth make and seal a deed and deliver it unto a stranger until certain conditions be performed."

The doctrine was, not that the deed must necessarily be delivered to a stranger, but that it must not be delivered to the grantee or covenantor. So far as we know, the ancient doctrine has never been expressly reversed so far as it relates to actual delivery of a deed at the time of sealing to the grantee or covenantor himself, and it was expressly recognized by Crompton, J., in *Pym v. Campbell* (25 L. J. Q. B., at p. 279). But it has been considerably modified by the observations of Hall, V.C., in *Watkins v. Nash* (L. R. 20 Eq. 262). In that case a re-conveyance was executed by one of two trustee-mortgagees expressly as an escrow, conditional on payment of the mortgage debt, and was left by him with his co-trustee. The co-trustee afterwards also executed the re-conveyance expressly as an escrow "upon the faith of an undertaking that the business should be forthwith settled," and handed the re-conveyance to the solicitor of the mortgagor. This was held to be a good delivery as an escrow, and the learned Vice-Chancellor in his judgment remarked, as to the execution by the first co-trustee (p. 266), "It is said that the deed thus executed could not be called an escrow, because it was not delivered to a stranger; and that is, no doubt, the way in which the rule is stated in some of the text-books—Sheppard's Touchstone for instance; but, when those authorities are examined, it will be found that it is not merely a technical question as to whether or not the deed is delivered into the hands of A. B. to be held conditionally; but, when a delivery to a stranger is spoken of, what is meant is a delivery of a character negating its being a delivery to the grantee or to the party who is to have the benefit of the instrument. You cannot deliver the deed to the grantee himself, it is said, because that would be inconsistent with its preserving the character of an escrow. But if, upon the whole of the transaction, it be clear that the delivery was not intended to be a delivery to the grantee at that time, but that it was to be something different, then you must not give effect to the delivery as being a complete delivery, that not being the intent of the persons who executed the instrument." So far the judgment merely correctly explains the effect of the old doctrine. But, as to the execution by the second co-trustee, the learned judge said he saw no difficulty in holding that, if it were a delivery to the solicitor acting for the mortgagor, "it was a delivery to him as an agent for all parties for the purpose of that delivery." It had been previously held that a deed might be delivered as an escrow to a solicitor acting for all the parties to it (*Millership v. Brookes*, 5 H. & N. 797); but, having regard to the old cases, it certainly seems a strong thing to hold that an escrow may be delivered to a solicitor acting for the grantee alone.

It is necessary to remember that a deed may either be delivered without words, or may be delivered by words without any act of

delivery (Co. Lit. 36a). Delivery without words meant actual handing over of the instrument to some specific person. For instance, in *Chamberlain v. Stanton* (Cro. Eliz. 122), the jury found that the defendant signed and sealed a bond "and then laid it on a table, and the plaintiff came and took it." All the justices held that it was not the defendant's deed. According to the modern practice, a deed is invariably delivered by words, and the words do not indicate any specific person to whom the delivery is made. We imagine that the occasions are rare in which there can be said to be an actual delivery by the grantor or covenantor to any specific person. The deed, after it has been signed by the grantor, and the magic words have been uttered by him, is usually left by him on the solicitor's table. Can a deed be an escrow when no particular person is selected as the person to whom it is delivered? According to Vice-Chancellor Hall, in *Watkins v. Nash*, a deed so executed and delivered may be an escrow, provided there was no delivery to the grantee, and it was intended that the instrument should be incomplete until the conditions prescribed had been performed.

It has long been settled that an express delivery as an escrow is not essential, if it can be implied, from all the circumstances, that the deed was not intended to operate until the fulfilment of certain conditions. As Parke, B., said in *Bowker v. Burdakin* (11 M. & W. 128), "I take it to be now settled, though the law was otherwise in ancient times, that in order to constitute the delivery of a writing as an escrow, it is not necessary that it should be done by express words, but you are to look at all the facts attending the execution, to all that took place at the time, and to the result of the transaction; and, therefore, although it is in form an absolute delivery, if it can be reasonably inferred that it was delivered not to take effect as a deed till a certain condition was performed, it will nevertheless operate as an escrow. What are the circumstances from which such an intention may be inferred? It was inferred in *Johnson v. Baker* (4 B. & Ald. 440), from the circumstance that a composition deed, after being executed by the surety, was delivered to one of the creditors to get it executed by the rest of the creditors (but see *Ponsford v. Walton*, L. R. 3 C. P. 167). In *Gudgen v. Besset* (6 E. & B. 986) a lease by deed executed by the lessor was held to be an escrow, on the ground that it was retained by the lessor, the lessee being let into possession as tenant from year to year only, until he paid a certain sum for fixtures. In this case Coleridge, J., said that the "detention of the parchment by the plaintiff himself is a fact very significant of what the intention was." On the other hand it was held, in *Doe v. Knight* (5 B. & C. 671), that if a party to an instrument seals it, and declares, in the presence of a witness, that he delivers it as his deed, but keeps it in his own possession, and there is nothing to qualify that, or to show that the executing party did not intend it to operate immediately, except the keeping of the deed in his own hands, it is a valid and effectual deed, and delivery to the party who is to take by the deed is not essential. The result of the cases seems to be to show that wherever the whole of the facts lead to an inference that an instrument, although not expressly delivered as an escrow, was not intended to operate until the performance of certain conditions, it will not operate as a deed until those conditions have been fulfilled.

The question whether an instrument has been executed only as an escrow is, in general, a question of fact for a jury; but there is some authority to show that, where the evidence is in writing, the construction of the evidence will be for the judge (see *Furness v. Meek*, 27 L. J. Ex. 34).

The new Bradford County Court Judge, Mr. J. J. Powell, Q.C., took his seat at Bradford for the first time on Tuesday. He was introduced by Mr. Daniel, Q.C., and Mr. J. G. Hutchinson, on behalf of the practitioners in the court, offered congratulations to the new judge. In the course of his reply his Honour said:—"To be the judge of a district such as this is a laborious task, and a very responsible task; and it is especially laborious and responsible in following a judge of whom in his presence I cannot say much, and of whom here it is unnecessary to say anything, because you all know him—that is, personally, not professionally or judicially—better than I do. I will, however, endeavour to do this, and I do not know that I can pursue a better course—I will earnestly endeavour to imitate his example. I will endeavour to be as patient, as courteous, as firm, as he has been, and if I cannot be as learned, if I cannot discharge the duties of the office as patiently as he has done, I will, nevertheless, endeavour to do so to the best of my capacity."

## REVIEWS.

## MERCANTILE AND MARITIME LAW.

A SELECTION OF LEADING CASES ON MERCANTILE AND MARITIME LAW. With Notes. By OWEN DAVIES TUDOR, Barrister-at-Law. THIRD EDITION. Maxwell & Son; H. Sweet; Stevens & Sons.

The portentous bulk of the English law at the present day is well illustrated by this useful volume; which, though it professes to deal only with one branch out of many, has in this edition reached 1,200 pages. In its general design it resembles the other well-known collections of leading cases for which the profession is indebted partly to Mr. Tudor alone and partly to his collaborator, Mr. White. The usefulness of partial digests of the law like the present volume is to a very appreciable extent dependent upon the reader's general knowledge of what is to be found there; and we think that a more detailed table of contents would have been a valuable supplement to the index. And it is even possible that the construction of such a table might have suggested to the learned author some improvements in his method of arrangement. We should have felt disposed to arrange the headings in the order of the generality of their application; placing first those which, as having the widest scope, are usually of the widest practical interest. It is quite in accordance with this principle of arrangement that the volume should begin, as it does, with the subject of the appropriation of payments (*Clayton's case*); but, instead of following this with the cases on bottomry, general average, and marine insurance, we should have preferred to go next to *Don v. Lippman*, which does not appear until p. 613, and the cases upon the conflict of law and the enforcement of foreign judgments; after which might have come the case of market overt, and the subjects of property in chattels, lien, and stoppage *in transitu*; as also the partnership cases, and the bankruptcy cases; leaving the cases on marine insurance and cognate subjects, which may be said to belong to municipal maritime law, and the cases on capture, blockade, and contraband of war, which belong to international maritime law, to close the volume. There is always room for much difference of opinion upon questions of arrangement; and it is with great diffidence that we submit our own views. But the sketch which we have given, if it serves no other purpose, will at all events supply any of our readers who do not happen to be acquainted with the work with an outline of the miscellaneous and extensive information contained in it. We need not say that a collection of the cases bearing upon the above-mentioned subjects will prove of the highest assistance to every lawyer who has any concern with mercantile affairs. The cases are brought well up to date, including in the addenda those reported in the *Law Reports* of January last. The changes made by the new Bankruptcy Act in the portions of bankruptcy law treated of in the book are fully noticed by Mr. Tudor. Thus, under the head of "Reputed Ownership," he points out (pp. 706, 709, 711) that the scope of the reputed ownership clause, which is now represented by section 44, sub-section (iii.), of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, has been restricted; for the chattels there referred to must be in the "possession, order, or disposition of the bankrupt in his trade or business." The words in italics, which take the place of the words in the Act of 1869, "being a trader," have much significance. Mr. Tudor justly observes that, "assuming the doctrine of reputed ownership to be founded on sound principles, the law as altered will be found in operation a great hardship to separate creditors, who may have given credit to a trader on the faith of his apparent ownership, as, for instance, of valuable furniture in a house not connected with his trade or business." The question of reputed ownership, especially in regard to its modification by the influence of trade customs, is one which has been examined more than once in our columns. We should hardly have been disposed to rely, as the learned author seems to do, upon the case of *Ex parte Hattersley* (26 W. R. 636, L. R. 8 Ch. D. 601) as a sufficient authority for the proposition, that the custom of hiring out pianos to be paid for by instalments is sufficiently established to take pianos so hired, by whatever class of persons, out of the "reputed ownership" clause, apparently without any reference to the qualification of the person by whom they are hired. Such is, undoubtedly, the import of that case; but we can feel no certainty that it would be followed by the Court of Appeal. Both the reason of the thing, and what seems to have been the *ratio decidendi* in *Crawcour v. Salter* (L. R. 18 Ch. D. 30), have always appeared to us to require, that in addition to a custom on the part of the lender to lend out pianos on hire, there should also be proved to exist a custom on the part of the hirer to take in pianos on hire. And the decision of the Court of Appeal in the recent case of *Ex parte Brooks*, *In re Fowler* (31 W. R. 833, L. R. 23 Ch. D. 261), seems to be a step further towards the general adoption of our view. We doubt whether it can, in future, be safely assumed upon the strength of *Ex parte Hattersley*, that the rule which, in *Ex parte Brooks*, was applied to furniture in general, does not apply to pianos.



## CONVEYANCING.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION TO CONVEYANCING, CONTAINING THE SUBSTANCE OF TWO COURSES OF LECTURES DELIVERED BEFORE THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY, REVISED WITH REFERENCE TO THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACTS, 1881, 1882, THE SETTLED LAND ACT, 1882, AND THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT, 1882. By HOWARD WARBURTON ELPHINSTONE, Barrister-at-Law. THIRD EDITION. W. Maxwell & Son.

We are glad to observe that this excellent manual has reached a third edition. It is as accurate, complete, and interesting an introduction to conveyancing as any student could desire; and we think the author is fully justified in his belief that "the student who has thoroughly mastered this book will be able, with the assistance of a good collection of common forms, to prepare any draft of ordinary occurrence." The new edition embodies the changes effected by the statutes mentioned in the title tersely, but, generally speaking, with sufficient explanation. The cases of importance since the last edition have been noted with great vigilance; we have not detected the omission of any decision which it is desirable the student should know; and the practical result of the decisions is very well given. The feature of the book is its practical treatment of the subject; it gives the student who is set down to prepare a draft exactly the explanations and information he requires in order to comprehend what he is about, and we do not know that higher praise could be given to a book of the kind. We may perhaps suggest that the index is capable of considerable improvement. There are no headings "Forfeiture" or "Re-entry," and some of the sub-headings are very meagre.

## BILLS OF SALE.

THE BILLS OF SALE ACTS, 1878 AND 1882, WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND EXPLANATORY NOTES, SHOWING THE CHANGES MADE IN THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO BILLS OF SALE, TOGETHER WITH AN APPENDIX OF PRECEDENTS, RULES OF COURT, FORMS, AND STATUTES. By EDWARD WILLIAM FITHIAN, Barrister-at-Law. SECOND EDITION. Stevens & Sons.

The principal feature of the new edition of Mr. Fithian's book is the collection of the decisions under the Act of 1882, which he gives in the notes to the sections at considerable length, "for the convenience of those readers who may be unable to refer to the law reports." Thus he devotes nearly five pages to the facts and judgment in *Davis v. Burton* (31 W. R. 523, 32 W. R. 423). He gives a reference to the other recent decisions on section 9, but does not speculate on the extent to which bills of sale may deviate from the statutory form, and contents himself with a laudatory reference to the precedents of bills of sale in *Prideaux*, which he reprints in the appendix to his work. The book will be useful as collecting the decisions up to date.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## A SUGGESTION TO AUTHORS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—If you agree with me that sufficient books on the Conveyancing, Bankruptcy, and other recent Acts have already been published, perhaps you will allow me to suggest to any gentleman who may be thinking of adding to the number that there is a more useful field of labour open to him. Equity and common lawyers are well supplied with digests of case law, but the conveyancer is in want of a ready guide to the precedents of which he may be in search. It is true that he has Mr. Copinger's Index, but, since it was published, many new editions of indexed works and many additional works have appeared, so that a considerable expenditure of time in searching for forms is still necessary. If an exhaustive index would be too heavy an undertaking, the index might be limited to works published since Mr. Copinger's Index, but it should, I think, contain references to common forms also; in other words, it should be a consolidated index to the table of contents and index of every book dealt with. It would be a matter for consideration whether all the forms should be indexed under such headings as Agreements, Conveyances, &c., following the arrangement of an ordinary table of contents, or whether the headings should not be to the subject-matter. It seems to me that some forms would be more usefully arranged on the latter plan. Take, for example, those relating to fee-farm rents or perpetual rent-charges. They may be arranged according to the following table, prepared for my own use, and which some of your readers may find of service.

Documents by virtue of which the above rents are authorised or agreed to be created:—

## I.—Powers authorizing sale at a rent—

## (1.) By trustees or tenant for life—

- (a.) of settlement of land in trust for sale: 2 Key & Elph. 465, 2nd ed.;
- (b.) of settlement of land purchased under power in personality settlement: 2 Key & Elph. 474;
- (c.) of strict settlement by deed: 3 Dav., pt. 2, 3rd ed., 1093 note; 2 Prid. 318, 12th ed.; 2 Key & E. 597 (full form), 618 (extending Settled Land Act); Wolst. & Turn. Settled Land, 100 (extending Act);
- (d.) of strict settlement by will: 2 Key & Elph. 780 (extending Act); Christie's Wills, 484, 2nd ed.;
- (e.) of will containing devise of land in trust for conversion: 4 Dav. 513, 3rd ed.; Christie's Wills, 308, 2nd ed.

## (2.) By mortgagee: 2 Key &amp; E. 146; 2 Dav., pt. 2, 4th ed., 588.

## II.—Powers (for a rent) to—

- (1.) Grant sites for churches, parks, &c.: 2 Key & E. 600; 3 Dav. 1222, 3rd ed.
- (2.) Exchange: 2 Key & E. 606.
- (3.) Partition: 2 Key & E. 606.
- (4.) Enfranchise: 2 Key & E. 607; 3 Dav. 1010, 1012; 4 Dav. 422.
- (5.) Grant easements: 2 Key & E. 608, 618; 3 Dav. 1216; 4 Dav. 508.
- (6.) Purchase easements: 2 Key & E. 608; 4 Dav. 508.

## III.—Conditions or contracts for sale at a rent—

- (1.) By public auction (buildings to be erected): 1 Key & E. 281.
- (2.) By private treaty (buildings to be erected): 1 Prid., 12th ed., 104; Emden's Building Leases, 391; and Jepson's Lands Clauses Acts.
- (3.) By private treaty (buildings erected), a gross sum being also paid: 1 Key & E. 287.
- (4.) To a railway company: 2 Dav., pt. 1, 60, 4th ed.

## Documents by which the rents are created:—

- (1.) Conveyance by owner in fee at a rent (buildings to be erected): 2 Dav., pt. 1, 504; Dav. Conc. Conv.; 1 Prid. 345, 12th ed.; 9 Byth. 518, 3rd ed.; Greenwood's Manual; 1 Rouse's Pract. Conv. 55, 3rd ed.; Hayes' C. C. 53, 4th ed.; Emden's Building Leases, 452; 1 Hughes' Conv. 138, 2nd ed.
- (2.) The like, purchaser taking the benefit of existing covenants and power of distress vested in the vendor as an indemnity against a previous rent: 1 Key & E. 499.
- (3.) Conveyance by owner in fee to a railway company at a rent: 1 Key & E. 512; 2 Dav., pt. 1, 571, 4th ed. [and in 3rd ed. 486]; Frenn & Ware's Railway Prec.
- (4.) Conveyance by tenants in common in fee at a rent with indemnity (by covenant and power of retention) against a previous rent (buildings erected): 1 Prid. 350.
- (5.) Appointment by tenant for life at a rent (buildings to be erected): 1 Prid. 353; Emden's Building Leases, 458.
- (6.) Conveyance by mortgagee and mortgagor at a rent limited to the mortgagee: 1 Key & E. 503; 1 Prid. 358.
- (7.) Grant of several rents, each to issue out of separate hereditaments: 1 Prid. 354.
- (8.) Grant of two rents by way of indemnity: 4 Byth. 175, 3rd ed.
- (9.) Grant of one rent: Lewis's Princ. Conv. 438; Greenwood's Manual, 3rd ed., 267; 1 Key & E. 385 n. (g.), 1st ed.; Prior's Conv. 134; 1 Bone's Conv. 324.
- (10.) Conveyance to trustees at a rent as an indemnity to purchasers against a previous rent: 5 Dav. pt. 2, 676, 2nd ed.; 4 Byth. 265, 2nd ed. [181, 3rd ed.].

## Documents dealing with the rents:—

## I.—On sale—

- (1.) Condition as to title to rent: 1 Key & E. 2nd ed., 254, 262; 1 Prid. 62; 9 Byth. 50, 3rd ed.
- (2.) Conveyance of rent: 1 Key & E. 505; 1 Prid. 357; 2 Dav. pt. 1, 264, 4th ed.; 1 Rouse's Pract. Conv. 78; 9 Byth. 630, 3rd ed.; Sweet's Conc. Conv. 200, 203; 1 Williams' Conv. 77.
- (3.) Conveyance of several rents, one being subject to part of a previous rent: 1 Key & E. 505.

## II.—On mortgage: 2 Dav. pt. 2, 581, 4th ed.; 5 Byth. 388, 2nd ed.; 6 Byth. 79, 2nd ed. [32 and 205, 3rd ed.]; 2 Hughes' Conv. 148, 2nd ed.

## III.—On exchange: 4 Byth. 92, 2nd ed. [16, 3rd ed.].

## IV.—On apportionment:—

## (1.) By rentowner—Deed of apportionment: 1 Key &amp; E. 61.

## (2.) By landowner—

- (a.) Conditions (at auction) apportioning rent between lots: 1 Key & E. 266; 1 Dav. 684, 4th ed.; 1 Prid. 70, 71.
- (b.) Deed containing cross-powers of distress, &c. (between purchasers or vendor and purchasers), as an indemnity to each against the payment of more than a proportionate part of a rent: 1 Prid. 363; 2 Grabb's Conv. 1004, 5th ed.
- (c.) Power for mortgagee to apportion rent on sale in lots: 2 Key & E. 147; 2 Dav. pt. 2, 581, 4th ed.

- (d.) Similar power for trustees: 2 Key & E. 465 n.  
 (e.) Apportionment of rent on partition of the land: 5 Dav. pt. 2, 3rd ed., 13; 2 Key & E. 278.
- V.—On release:—
- (1.) Agreement not to distrain: 6 Byth. 3rd ed., 403 (9 Byth. 3rd ed., 868; and for an assignment of a life annuity to trustees upon trust to receive it out of part of the lands: see 9 Byth. 870, and Prior, 140; and for an agreement to indemnify against by person entitled to rent for life: see 9 Byth. 868; Prior, 139; Sweet's Conc. Conv. 231).
- (2.) Agreement giving landowner option to purchase the rent within stated time: 1 Key & E. 502; Hayes' Conc. Conv. 4th ed., 60; Prior, 135.
- (3.) To landowner to extinguish the rent: 1 Prid. 414; Sweet's C. C. 201, 203; 3 Wilde's Suppl. 674, 3rd ed.
- (4.) To a trustee for landowner to keep the rent on foot: 2 Key & E. 383; Sweet's C. C. 200.
- (5.) In discharge of part of the land: 2 Prid. 609 (see also above, V. (1)).
- Documents dealing with land subject to rent:—
- I.—On sale:—
- (1.) Conditions (at auction):—
- (a.) Providing for part of purchase-money being vested in trustees as an indemnity against rent: Hayes' C. C. 4th ed., 485.  
 (b.) Charging rent on one lot only and providing indemnity to other lots: 1 Key & E. 260; 1 Dav. 4th ed., 684, 685, 686, 688.  
 (c.) The like without indemnity: Hayes' C. C. 484.  
 (d.) As to title to land subject to part of a rent not legally apportioned: 1 Dav. 686, 687; 1 Prid. 71; 9 Byth. 43, 3rd ed.  
 (e.) That the land is subject to rent, &c.: 1 Prid. 63, 71.
- (2.) Agreement for sale of freeholds which are subject to rent: 1 Prid. 104.
- (3.) Conveyance of freeholds which are subject to a rent: Dav. C. C. 164, 13th ed.; 1 Prid. 356; 2 Dav. pt. 1, 473.
- (4.) Conveyance of dwelling-house subject to part of a rent: 1 Prid. 359.
- (5.) Deed charging rent exclusively on part of the land, with power of distress: 4 Byth. 191, 194, 3rd ed.; 2 Crabb's Conv. 5th ed., 999, 1000.
- II.—On mortgage:—
- (1.) By owner in fee: 2 Dav. pt. 2, 581, 4th ed.  
 (2.) By tenants in common in fee of two properties subject to separate rent for each: 2 Key & E. 144.
- III.—On partition (see above, "Apportionment" (2) e.):—
- Documents creating an indemnity against the rent:—
- I.—To purchasers by creation of another rent: 1 Key & E. 604; 5 Dav. pt. 2, 207, 3rd ed.; 4 Byth. 3rd ed., 175, 181; 2 Crabb, 1000; 2 Wilde's Suppl. 589.
- II.—To person purchasing at a rent by giving him power to retain his rent: 1 Prid. 352.
- III.—By giving power of distress: 1 Key & E. 607; Hayes' C. C. 383; 2 Martin's Conv. 148, 775; 4 Byth. 191, 194, 3rd ed.; 2 Crabb, 999.
- IV.—By vesting a sum of stock in a trustee: Prior, 141; 4 Byth. 294, 2nd ed.
- V.—By vesting land in trustees: 2 Crabb, 1004.

COUNTRY SOLICITOR.

[No one can be better qualified than our correspondent to prepare the work he suggests.—Ed. S. J.]

## A NOVEL PROPOSAL.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The following advertisement may, perhaps, interest some of your readers. It appears in the *Times* of April 18, p. 14, 4th column, third from the top.

A. N. B.

[The following is the advertisement referred to by our correspondent:—

"A solicitor, competent and experienced, will undertake the legal work of business firms by contract, according to the American system, for a small sum annually. Highest references and security if required.—W. 907, Address and Inquiry Office, the *Times* Office, E.C."]

On Thursday a deputation of bankers had an interview with Mr. Chamberlain with reference to the fee of £3 charged for opening a local banking account. Sir John Lubbock said it was contrary to the compromise come to when the Bankruptcy Bill was before the Committee on Trade. Mr. Chamberlain, in reply, denied that there was any understanding on the matter, and said that the fee charged was not only right in principle, but reasonable in amount.

## THE NEW PRACTICE.

R. S. C., 1883, ORD. 31, R. 12.—DISCOVERY—PRODUCTION OF BOOKS OF BUSINESS—TRUSTEE—BREACH OF TRUST—EMPLOYMENT OF TRUST MONEY IN TRUSTEE'S OWN BUSINESS—DISCOVERY IN AID OF CASE AGAINST CO-TRUSTEE.

In a case of *Whitham v. Whitham*, before Pearson, J., on the 22nd inst., a question arose as to the production by a trustee of the books relating to his own business in aid of a case alleged by a *cestui que trust* against a co-trustee. The action was brought by *cestuis que trustant* against a trustee, and the representatives of some deceased co-trustees, to compel the defendants to make good trust moneys which the trustee defendant, with the concurrence of the deceased co-trustees, had improperly employed in his business. The defendant did not, by his pleading, deny that he had employed the trust moneys in his business. The plaintiffs claimed production of the books of the trustee's business, and he resisted the production, on the ground that the discovery was not material before the trial of the action, and also that the plaintiffs were not entitled to any discovery from the trustee to assist them in establishing their case against the representatives of the deceased co-trustees, which case was that the deceased co-trustees could have recovered the trust moneys from the trustee defendant if they had sued him for them, and that they had been guilty of wilful default in not suing him; and it was contended that a plaintiff is entitled to discovery from a defendant only of matters relevant to an issue between him and the defendant, and not for the purpose of enabling the plaintiff to establish an issue between himself and another defendant which does not arise between the plaintiff and the defendant from whom the discovery is sought. On behalf of the plaintiffs it was urged that the discovery of the books would enable them to elect at the trial without further inquiry whether they would claim from the defendant trustee interest at five per cent. on the trust moneys which he had employed in his business, or the profits which he had derived from the employment of the moneys, and also that the books would show whether the trustee had been solvent, so that the co-trustees could successfully have sued him for the trust moneys. PEARSON, J., held that on both grounds the plaintiffs were entitled to production of the books. The trustee having admitted that he had employed the trust moneys in his business, the plaintiffs would be entitled, at the trial of the action, to a judgment either for the profits made by the trustee by the employment of the trust moneys, or for interest on those moneys at five per cent., and the discovery would be material to enable the plaintiffs to elect which alternative they would adopt. And, as to the case against the representatives of the deceased co-trustees, the point raised was an important one. It was said that a defendant could not be compelled to produce books which he would not be liable to produce as regarded any issue between himself and the plaintiff, in order to enable the plaintiff to obtain judgment upon an issue between himself and another defendant. But, having regard to the special circumstances of the present case, his lordship thought it was not necessary to decide this point. It was alleged that the production of the trustee's books would show that the *cestuis que trustant* were entitled to be paid out of the estates of the deceased co-trustees, and his lordship thought that a trustee could not refuse to produce books in his possession, the production of which have the effect of saving the trust estate from loss. No doubt r. 12, of ord. 31, was wider than the old rule; it enabled the court to direct discovery to be made by "any other party" to an action, and not merely by the opposite party, and the court had the widest discretion whether it would make the order or not. If the court either thought that the order asked for was unnecessary, or had any doubt whether it would not work injustice, it had power to hold its hand. In the present case his lordship considered that the discovery could not by any possibility do injustice to anyone, and he thought it would do justice to the plaintiffs.—COUNSEL, *Coxens Hardy, Q.C.*, and *Swinfen Eady; Diddin*. SOLICITORS, *Blair & W. B. Girling; Jacobs & Vincent*.

## BANKRUPTCY CASES.

## QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

## IN BANKRUPTCY.

(Before CAVE, J.)

April 22.—*In re Wilkinson*.

An important question of costs arose in this case. The official receiver, as trustee, applied to set aside an assignment, upon the ground that it constituted a fraudulent preference, but the learned judge, being dissatisfied with the evidence, dismissed the application.

E. C. Willis, Q.C., and Oswald, for the respondent, asked that the costs should follow the result, and be borne by the official receiver. They pointed out that the application had been made by the official receiver in his capacity of trustee, and not as an officer of the court, and they submitted that there was no reason why the official receiver should stand in a better position than an ordinary litigant.

Biggam, Q.C., and Chalmers, appeared for the official receiver.

CAVE, J., intimated that he would allow the costs out of the estate.

Willis asked that the costs should be allowed in priority to those of the official receiver. The estate might be eaten up, and nothing left to pay the costs of the respondent of successfully resisting an expensive application.

CAVE, J., said the official receiver was entitled to take the opinion of the court in certain matters, and he did not think he ought, except in an extreme case, to be made personally liable for costs. In the present case all he could do was to give the respondent his costs out of the estate in priority to any subsequent costs.—*Times*.



## CASES OF THE WEEK.

**COMPANY—WINDING UP—INSUFFICIENT ASSETS—COSTS—PRIORITY—EXTERNAL LITIGATION—GENERAL COSTS OF WINDING UP—CHANGE OF LIQUIDATOR'S SOLICITOR.**—On the 22nd inst., the Court of Appeal (BAGGALLAY, COTTON, and LINDLEY, L.JJ.) affirmed the decision of Pearson, J., in *In re The Dominion of Canada Plumbago Company* (32 W. R. 425, ante, p. 274). The question was as to the priority of costs in the winding up of the company. B. had acted as solicitor to the official liquidator in the winding up from the date of his appointment until August, 1880, when the liquidator changed his solicitor. The assets of the company were insufficient to pay the costs incurred in the winding up, the only assets in the hands of the liquidator (exclusively of certain sums paid away by him and not now in question) being a sum of £35 17s. 11d., which had been realized by a sale of the company's stock-in-trade. After the change of solicitors the liquidator had unsuccessfully applied to have one Kirby placed on the list of contributories, and Fry, J., in dismissing the application, made the following order:—"The court does not think fit to make any order upon this application, but doth order the official liquidator to pay Mr. Kirby the costs of the application, to be taxed, &c., and to retain them out of the assets." These costs were taxed at £23 5s. 2d., and the liquidator having paid that amount out of the £35 17s. 11d., there remained a small balance in his hands. B., whose costs as solicitor in the liquidation had been taxed at £167 8s. 6d., took out a summons, asking that the liquidator might be ordered to pay to him the amount of his taxed costs. The question was whether in the administration of the assets the liquidator was justified in paying to a litigant who had succeeded against the company his costs in priority to the general costs of the liquidation. There were two conflicting decisions upon this point. In *In re The Home Investment Society* (L. R. 14 Ch. D. 167), Malins, V.C., held that the costs of successful adverse litigation against the company must be paid out of the assets in priority to the costs of the winding up; while in *In re The Dronfield Silkestone Coal Company* (L. R. 23 Ch. D. 511), Chitty, J., decided that where the assets were insufficient for payment in full of costs, the costs of realizing the assets were payable in priority to the costs of external litigation, and that the successful litigant was only entitled to have his costs paid out of the remaining assets rateably. Pearson, J., held that the costs of the litigant, Kirby, being costs of external litigation, ranked in priority to B.'s costs, and that the liquidator was right in paying them forthwith out of the assets then in hand, without providing either for the costs of realization or the general costs of the winding up, and his lordship directed the balance in the liquidator's hands, after payment of Kirby's costs, to be apportioned between the liquidator and B. This order was affirmed by the Court of Appeal. BAGGALLAY, L.J., said that the order of Fry, J., was conclusive in giving priority to the official liquidator over all other creditors in respect of the costs which he was directed to pay to Kirby. It was true that those costs were not ordered to be paid out of the assets of the company, but the liquidator was ordered to pay them, and he had done so in obedience to the order of the court, and was entitled to recoup himself out of the assets in priority to anyone else. With respect to the balance his lordship was of opinion that the learned judge had discretion to deal with it under section 110 of the Companies Act, 1862, and that he had pursued a reasonable course in apportioning it as he had done. The order appealed from was perfectly right. COTTON and LINDLEY, L.JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Dunham; Cockson, Q.C., and Seward Price. SOLICITORS, Beall & Co.; Bolton, Robbins, Bush, & Co.*

**DIVORCE—DECREE NISI FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE—INTERVENTION OF THIRD PARTY—23 & 24 VICT. c. 144, s. 7.**—In a case of *Hewarth v. Hewarth*, before the Court of Appeal on the 23rd inst., a question arose with reference to the provision of the Divorce Act of 1860, which enables a third party to intervene after a decree nisi has been made for the dissolution of a marriage. Section 7 of the Act (23 & 24 VICT. c. 144) provides that every decree for a divorce shall, in the first instance, be a decree nisi not to be made absolute till after the expiration of such time (not less than three months from the pronouncing thereof) as the court shall direct; "and during that period any person shall be at liberty, in such manner as the court shall direct, to show cause why the said decree should not be made absolute by reason of the same having been obtained by collusion, or by reason of material facts not being brought before the court, and, on cause being so shown, the court shall deal with the case by making the decree absolute, or by reversing the decree nisi, or by requiring further inquiry or otherwise as justice may require." In the present case a wife petitioned for a dissolution of her marriage on the ground of cruelty and adultery by her husband. The husband raised counter-charges of adultery against the petitioner. The case was tried before Butt, J., without a jury, and a decree nisi for a dissolution was granted on the 18th of June, 1883, his lordship being of opinion that the petitioner had established her case against the respondent of adultery, coupled with cruelty; and that, although there were circumstances which gave rise to very grave suspicions, the charges of adultery made against her were not sufficiently proved. The husband obtained a rule nisi for a new trial, and adduced further evidence by affidavit of alleged acts of adultery on the part of the petitioner, but the rule was discharged. Notice of appeal was given by the husband, but was afterwards withdrawn, and the appeal was accordingly dismissed. On the 18th of December, 1883, a motion was made on behalf of the wife that the decree nisi might be made absolute. In the meantime a Mr. Walker, who was the uncle of the husband, had applied for leave to intervene, and he opposed the motion to make the decree absolute. In the result that motion was rejected pending the application to intervene, but with leave to the wife to move the court to reject the intervention.

After argument HANNEN, P., allowed the intervention upon the terms of the intervener giving the petitioner security for costs, and directed the question whether the petitioner had committed adultery, as alleged in the further affidavits on which the intervener relied, to be tried by a special jury. The Court of Appeal (BAGGALLAY, COTTON, and LINDLEY, L.JJ.) affirmed the decision. BAGGALLAY, L.J., said that it had been contended on behalf of the appellant, first, that the intervention, though in the name of Walker, was in reality at the instance of the husband, and accordingly was collusive and must be rejected; and, secondly, that, even assuming that Walker had intervened independently, the facts relied upon in support of his intervention were before the court in the affidavits filed upon the application for a new trial which the court had refused, and, therefore, that there were no "material facts not brought before the court" to induce the court to allow the intervention. Until the Act, 23 & 24 VICT. c. 144, there was no provision for intervention by any third party or by the Attorney-General; and the right was first given by section 7 of that Act. Now in this case there was no suggestion that the decree nisi had been obtained by any collusion between the petitioner and the respondent, and therefore the proposed intervention must be on the ground of material facts which were not brought before the court at the time when the decree nisi was made. His lordship had come to the conclusion that the facts stated in the affidavits were facts more or less material which had not been brought before the court when the decree nisi was pronounced. Assuming, therefore, that Mr. Walker was intervening independently, and not in collusion with the respondent, there were circumstances alleged which would justify the court in accepting his intervention; and he was unable to see why he should be considered as intervening collusively with the respondent. COTTON, L.J., was of the same opinion. To induce the court to allow the proposed intervention the intervener must show that there were material facts which were not brought before the judge when he made the decree nisi. The acts of adultery now alleged were certainly not before the court when the decree nisi was made. It was enough to say that this was a matter which ought to be put into a course of investigation. If it had been shown that Walker was merely the agent of the respondent, it would be wrong to allow the respondent under a different name to obtain the advantage of an appeal which he had abandoned; but there was nothing to justify the assertion that Walker was acting as the mouthpiece and in the interests of the respondent. LINDLEY, L.J., pointed out that the further affidavits, though filed for the purposes of the application for a new trial, were obviously not "brought before the court" in the sense used in the statute. The court to which the application for a new trial was made could not try the question over again on these affidavits, but would only look at them for the purpose of seeing if it was a proper case for granting a new trial.—COUNSEL, *Inderwick, Q.C., and Middleton; Charles Russell, Q.C., Bigham, Q.C., and Bayford. SOLICITORS, Chester, Mayhew, & Co.; Gregory, Rowcliffe, & Co.*

**SOLICITOR—ATTACHMENT—DISOBEDIENCE TO ORDER TO DELIVER UP BONDS FORMING PART OF TRUST ESTATE—DEBTORS ACT, 1878, s. 1.**—In a case before Pearson, J., on the 22nd inst., an application was made for an order of attachment against a solicitor for disobedience to an order which had been previously made on him to deliver over to some trustees, for whom he had acted as solicitor, some bonds of a foreign Government, payable to bearer, which formed part of the trust estate, and which he had received as solicitor to the trustees knowing that they were part of the trust property. The order directed him to deliver up the bonds to the trustees, or to pay to the trustees the market value of the bonds. It was urged on behalf of the solicitor that this was a mere order for the payment of money, and that, the solicitor being unable to comply with it, the court would not, since the passing of the Debtors Act, 1878 (41 & 42 VICT. c. 54), s. 1, make a vindictive order for his attachment in order to punish him, reliance being placed on *Barrett v. Hammond* (L. R. 10 Ch. D. 285). PEARSON, J., made the order for attachment. He said that *Barrett v. Hammond* was a case of debt. He did not consider that the order in the present case was a money order at all. There was no debt, but a professional man, having in his possession bonds which he knew were subject to a trust, had apparently made an improper use of them. The order for attachment must be made, but it would not be enforced for a week, so as to give the solicitor an opportunity of obeying the original order.—COUNSEL, *C. H. Turner; Oncaid. SOLICITOR FOR APPLICANTS, W. E. Ruddle.*

**PRACTICE—MOTION TO DISCHARGE—ORDER MADE IN CHAMBERS—FURTHER EVIDENCE.**—In a case of *In re Munns and Longden*, before Kay, J., on the 22nd inst., a question arose as to the right to offer further evidence on a motion to discharge an order made on summons in chambers. Certain trustees in bankruptcy took out a summons for taxation of a bill of costs incurred by their solicitor in realizing a certain security. The bill had been already paid by the trustees, and the judge dismissed the summons, on the ground that no special circumstances had been shown which could justify an order for taxation after payment, in accordance with 6 & 7 VICT. c. 73, s. 41. The trustees now moved to discharge this order, and offered further evidence to support their application for taxation. KAY, J., said there was no precedent for receiving further evidence, nor was he aware of any practice which would allow him to admit such evidence. After a judge had deliberately given his decision in chambers and shown the weak points of a case it would be a most dangerous practice to admit further evidence on a motion to discharge. The application was, in fact, to his lordship to review his former decision. His lordship refused to admit the evidence in question, and dismissed the motion.—COUNSEL, *Graham Hastings, Q.C., and Latham; Kekewich, Q.C., and J. Beaumont; SOLICITORS, Munns & Longden; F. Heritage.*

## SOLICITORS' CASES.

CLERKENWELL POLICE COURT.

April 17.—*Re Edward George Tattershall.*

Edward George Tattershall, solicitor, of 9, Great James-street, Bedford-row, London, was charged before Mr. Barstow with having converted to his own use and benefit the sum of £3,000, which he had been directed in writing to pay into the Chancery Division to the credit of the trustees' account of the Mitchell estate. The prisoner was arrested on the previous Thursday on a warrant obtained by Mr. John Mitchell, of Swaithe, near Barnsley, Yorkshire, colliery manager, who, it appears, is a party beneficially interested in the various sums paid into the Chancery Division in the action of *Mitchell v. Mitchell*.

*Bewick*, solicitor, appeared for the prosecutor; and  
*M. W. Mattinson* appeared for the defendant.

*Bewick* said the proceedings were taken under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 71, and the prisoner was charged that he, being a solicitor intrusted with money for a specific purpose, had applied it to his own use. It now appeared that the prisoner had appropriated more than the £3,000 with which he had been charged; there were other sums which he had failed to pay in—the total amounting altogether to £8,564 5s. 9d.

Mr. John Mitchell, colliery manager, residing at Swaithe, near Barnsley, said he was trustee of the estate of Joseph Mitchell, deceased, by the will of his late father. That estate is being administered by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice. Witness' brother, Joseph Mitchell, had been appointed manager of the colliery by the Court of Chancery, and it was his duty as manager to pay the balances in his hand from time to time into the Chancery Division. The Mitchell Main Colliery was a portion of witness' father's estate, and was situate near Barnsley. The letter produced was in the handwriting of witness' brother, Joseph Mitchell, and was dated the 9th of January, 1882. It was addressed to the defendant, and stated that, as there was then a balance of £7,230 14s. 2d. in the hands of the bankers, which was not all required for the working of the colliery, a cheque for the sum of £3,000, drawn on the Barnsley Banking Company, payable to Singleton & Tattershall, was forwarded to the defendant, directing him to pay it into the Chancery Division in the cause of *Mitchell v. Mitchell*. The cheque for £3,000 was now produced. Witness made inquiry at the Chancery offices on the 9th of this month, the day before the warrant for the arrest of the defendant was obtained.

Cross-examined: Mr. Joseph Mitchell was not there to-day, because he had a prior engagement. Messrs. Singleton & Tattershall were solicitors for the plaintiffs in the action of *Mitchell v. Mitchell*. The suit was not a friendly one, but a hostile one. The sum of £3,000 was then, in January, 1882, represented as profits of the colliery, and, as such, should be paid to the credit of the action. After the cheque was drawn, there was a question to which account the money should be paid. Could not say if Mr. Verey, one of the officials of the High Court of Justice, had been applied to to say what sum should be paid into court.

Re-examined: It was the duty of Joseph Mitchell to pay all sums received by way of profits into the Chancery Division without reference to their distribution.

By the Court: Messrs. Singleton & Tattershall had no right to touch the money sent to them; they had no share in the colliery.

Mr. Alfred Hawkins deposed that he was managing chancery clerk to Messrs. Torr & Co., of 38, Bedford-row, who are the defendants' London solicitors, in the action of *Mitchell v. Mitchell*. Witness produced an order made by Mr. Justice Chitty on the 21st of March, 1884, calling upon Joseph Mitchell and Messrs. Singleton & Tattershall to pay into court, on the following day, the sum of £8,564 5s. 9d. The prisoner was present when the order was made, and he admitted that that sum had been placed in his hands. The £3,000 now in question formed part of that larger sum. Witness produced the prisoner's receipt for this sum, and a letter asking for a balance-sheet up to the end of the year. Witness also produced prisoner's pass-book on the Union Bank of London, showing that he had paid the £3,000 into his own account, but there was nothing wrong about that. Solicitors often received money which they paid in to their account, and then paid it out again. The witness produced the Paymaster-General's certificate that the money had not been paid into the Chancery Pay Office in the suit of *Mitchell v. Mitchell*.

Cross-examined: Money was paid in by solicitors to their own account every day in the way that the prisoner had paid the £3,000 in to the account of Messrs. Singleton & Tattershall.

Re-examined: Before applying to Mr. Justice Chitty witness frequently applied to the prisoner to pay the money into court, but he always stated that no money had ever been remitted to him. Witness satisfied Mr. Justice Chitty that the money had been received, and he ordered it to be paid by the prisoner without delay.

Mr. John Carter Peacock, clerk to Messrs. Ridsdale & Son, solicitors, of 5, Gray's-inn-square, said that his firm now took the place of the prisoner for Mr. Joseph Mitchell in the Chancery suit of *Mitchell v. Mitchell*, and he produced Mr. Mitchell's bank-book, proving that the £3,000 had been paid by his bankers.

*Bewick* said that he would ask for a remand to produce the manager of the Barnsley Bank.

Mr. BARSTOW said that there was a *prima facie* case against the prisoner, quite enough to commit him.

*Mattinson* said that he did not propose to address the court now, as there was, no doubt, a *prima facie* case against the prisoner.

Mr. BARSTOW then committed the prisoner to take his trial at the Central Criminal Court, the prisoner stating that he would reserve his defence.—*Sheffield Daily Telegraph.*

## SOCIETIES.

## INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The following notices have been given for the special general meeting of the members of the society to be held on the 30th inst:—

Mr. CHARLES FORD will ask: Whether the council are in communication with the recently appointed Bar Committee in regard to the discipline of the bar, and in regard to the proceedings of such committee as reported in the *Times* of the 20th of February last, page 11.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move, and Mr. EDWIN LOW will second, the following:—That the interests of suitors and the convenience of the profession require that the practice which obtains in all the other divisions of the High Court of setting down motions and of taking them in the order in which they stand in the lists should be extended to the Chancery Division, and thus avoid the present confusion, expense, and delay which arises in such division in connection with motions to the court.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move:—That it is not desirable that the office of assistant examiner of the society should be conferred upon the partners of members of the council of the society.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move, and Mr. W. P. W. PHILLIMORE will second, the repeal of the following bye-law, as adopted at the general meeting held on the 13th of July, 1883, viz.:—It shall not be competent for the president or other chairman at a general meeting of the society, without the express sanction of the council first obtained thereto, to allow any discussion to take place upon any matter, or to put to such meeting any resolution thereon, if it appears to him that the question raised upon such discussion or resolution has in substance been decided at any general meeting of the society held within the twelve months immediately preceding.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move: That the council do print and send to every member of the society a copy of the second or supplemental report of the special committee of the society on legal procedure.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move, and Mr. PHILLIMORE will second: That it be an instruction to the council in future issues of the Law Society's Calendar to give information as to any club or other like institution in occupation of part of the society's premises.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move and Mr. GEORGE WHALE, of Woolwich, will second, the following: That the following be bye-laws of the society:

(a) At any general meeting, when a division has been demanded, either before or immediately on the declaration of the show of hands, such division shall immediately take place, the "Ayes" assembling together on the chairman's right hand, the "Noes" on his left. The mover of the original motion being the teller to count the "Noes," or the supporter of any amendment, and the mover of the amendment, or if no amendment, any supporter of the negative, to be named by the president, shall be the teller to count the "Ayes." If two tellers on each side be required, the seconder of the original motion shall be associated with the teller of the "Noes," and the seconder of the amendment or another supporter of the negative, to be named by the chairman, shall be associated with the teller of the "Ayes."

(b) Whenever, on a show of hands, or on a division, it shall appear that the minority amounts to one-third of the whole number of votes, and on the declaration of the result, a poll shall have been then and there demanded by any voter, the same shall be ordered and shall take place in manner directed by bye-laws 15 and 18, in the case of an election by voting papers, *mutatis mutandis*.

(c) The voting paper shall be in such form otherwise as the council shall direct, but shall in every case contain the words of the motion, the voter being required to state whether he is "For" or "Against" such motion. And if the vote be taken on an amendment, the voter shall also state, in a similar manner, what his vote would be on the original question as amended, if the amendment should be carried, and what on the original question if the amendment should be rejected.

(d) The votes so given shall be recorded on the minutes, and have the same effect as if they had been personally given at the meeting.

(e) The question known as the "previous question" shall not be moved or proposed by way of amendment, but in lieu thereof a member may move by way of amendment, "That this meeting proceed to the next business."

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move:—That this society learns with satisfaction that the question of the amalgamation of the two branches of the legal profession in Ireland has been recently under the consideration of the Irish Incorporated and other Irish law societies, and feels that the time is not far distant when, on public grounds, it may be expedient to consider the same question as applied to England.

Mr. F. K. MURTON will move: That it is desirable to adopt the recommendations contained in the county court report presented by the society's committee, subject to a separate vote being taken on the last resolution, as to which the committee were equally divided.

Mr. EDWARD BROMLEY has given notice that he will move: That, having regard to the present very indifferent acoustic properties of the hall, the council be requested to consider whether any and what measures can be taken to remedy the existing defects of the building.

Mr. T. W. ROSERREN has given notice that he will ask the following questions: (1.) Whether the statement appearing in the *Times* and other newspapers, to the effect that an action has been commenced against the Council of the Law Society in reference to the Law Club, is correct; and, if so, the parties to, and the nature of, such action, and its present position? (2.) What (if any) steps the council propose taking with a view of



ascertaining the opinion of the society whether any such action ought, in the interest of the society, to be defended or not? (3.) What is the result of the promised negotiations between the council and the Law Society since the last special general meeting in reference to the Law Club question?

Mr. H. STARKER COLDICOTT will move: That it is desirable that the opinion of the general body of members should be taken on an early date as to whether the action of Mr. Charles Ford in the High Court in regard to the Law Club questions should be defended.

Mr. CHARLES FORD will ask: How many committees of the council are there, and what are the special duties of each, and how often do such committees meet?

Mr. CHARLES FORD will move: That, in the opinion of this society, the Rules Committee of the society, recently appointed by the council, on the motion of Mr. F. K. Munton, is not a satisfactory committee, and indicates a want of confidence by the council in the general body of members of the society.

Mr. W. P. W. PHILLIMORE will ask: (1.) Whether the opinion of counsel has been taken as to the legality of the new club suggested in the circular, dated the 27th of March last, and, if so, what is its purport? (2.) Whether any (and how many) members have offered to join the suggested new club, and, if so, how many were members of the Law Club? (3.) Why no information has been given to members in the above circular of an action, or actions, brought against the council in respect of the Law Club? (4.) Whether the council, in view of the additional room now at their disposal, will take steps to prevent the hall and library being closed for examination purposes?

Mr. GEORGE WHALE will move: That (in lieu of the proposed new club for such members as pay special fees) the council be requested, as soon as possible, to open luncheon, coffee, and smoking rooms for the benefit of members generally.

Mr. J. R. MACARTHUR has given notice that he will move: (1.) That the replies received by the secretary to his circular, dated the 27th of March last, headed "The Law Society Club," be laid before the meeting. (2.) That a committee of members be appointed to examine and report thereon. (3.) That notice of any special meetings of the society be sent out twenty-four days at least before the date of such meeting.

#### SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The fifty-second half-yearly general meeting of members of this association was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on Wednesday, the 23rd inst., at 2 o'clock p.m. Mr. William Beriah Brook presided, and among the directors present were Messrs. J. H. Karp, Philip Rickman, Edwin Hedger, Samuel Harris, F. T. Woolbert. The report and balance-sheet as in print and in the hands of those present were taken as read. The following is a copy of the report:—

The directors have pleasure in presenting their fifty-second half-yearly report, which shows the increasing progress and usefulness of the association.

Since the last report in October, 1883, 77 new members have been admitted, thereby increasing the aggregate number enrolled to 2,764, of whom 1,043 are life members, and 1,721 annual subscribers. Fifty of the life members are also annual contributors of from one to ten guineas each.

The usual audited statement of receipts and expenditure is appended, from which it will be seen that the receipts from all sources during the half-year terminating on February 29, 1884, amounted to £3,027 18s. This, compared with the corresponding period of last year, shows satisfactory progress, and the board are glad to report a steady increase in the amount of regular subscriptions.

During the same period of six months, the directors have awarded grants, to those in need of assistance, amounting to £1,140—viz., £430 in the relief of nine cases of members and their families (an average of nearly £48), and £710 among fifty cases of non-members and their families (an average of about £14). The sum of £112 10s. was also paid in the half-year to annuitants, from the income of the late Miss Ellen Reardon's bequest, &c. The number of cases for relief presented to the board from non-members and their families is rapidly increasing, and every possible investigation is made into the merits of each application. The directors would again ask all members to thoroughly satisfy themselves as to the deserts of applicants before recommending the cases to the board for consideration.

The balance at the Union Bank of London on February 29 was £542 0s. 11d., of which £110 15s. 10d. pertained to the Reardon Trust Account, being the surplus of receipts over expenditure to date, liable to investment at the discretion of the directors; £15 was also in the hands of the secretary. A sum of £449 1s. 6d. Reduced Three per Cents. was purchased during the half-year, and the total funded capital of the association (including the Reardon Bequest) on February 29 amounted to £47,894 9s. 5d., as detailed and certified on the appended abstract of receipts and expenditure.

The directors much regret having to record the decease of three of their colleagues—viz., Mr. W. S. Allen, of Birmingham; Mr. Jas. Croesley, of Manchester; and Mr. George Essell, of Rochester—in whose places they have elected Mr. Cornelius T. Saunders, of Birmingham; Mr. W. Hodgkinson Guest, of Manchester; and Mr. Henry Kitson, of Wolverhampton, to serve on the board.

The directors have great pleasure in announcing that Sir Thomas Paine has kindly consented to preside at the twenty-fourth anniversary festival on Wednesday, June 18 next, at the Star and Garter Hotel, Richmond. The board very earnestly hope for the hearty co-operation and support of their professional brethren throughout the kingdom on

that occasion. Several gentlemen have already consented to be stewards, and the secretary will be glad to receive further names, and also contributions for announcement at the festival. It is gratifying to note how much good is often effected by the earnest efforts of individual members in their respective localities, and the directors venture to hope that the forthcoming festival will be made an opportunity for soliciting new subscriptions and donations by those who are anxious to forward the interests of the association.

The formation of local committees in large centres, especially in towns where there are provincial law societies, has been several times suggested. The directors will be glad in any way to promote the establishment of such committees, as tending to encourage local efforts on behalf of the funds. The ramifications of the association have conferred benefits in all parts of the kingdom, and it now remains to enlist the sympathy and support of those who have not yet become subscribers, in order to strengthen and build up the work that has been undertaken. Your directors close this report with earnest hopes that the resources of the association may be materially strengthened by local efforts throughout the kingdom in future.

The chairman moved the adoption of the report, and the motion being seconded by Mr. Philip Rickman was carried unanimously. Mr. G. A. Crowder proposed, and Mr. V. J. Chamberlain seconded, a vote of thanks to the directors and auditors for their services during the past half-year, which was unanimously carried. Mr. Samuel Harris, of Leicester, proposed a hearty vote of thanks to the chairman (Mr. W. B. Brook) for his kind services at all times, and for presiding at the present meeting. Mr. Grantham R. Dodd seconded the resolution, which was unanimously carried. Thanks to the secretary for his services concluded the meeting.

#### COURT FEES.

The following objections to the Bill to make further provision with respect to moneys advanced for the building of the Royal Courts of Justice have been issued by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society:—

Under the new rules the court fees payable by the suitors have been increased to the extent of about £35,000 per annum, thus greatly adding to the cost of litigation, which it was the object of the altered practice of the courts to diminish.

If the Bill passes, it must be at least three years, and it may be five years, before these fees can be reduced; while, on the other hand, they may, and probably will, be still further largely increased.

This increase in the court fees is required partly to reimburse the Treasury the amount by which the estimates for the erection of the Royal Courts of Justice and offices have been exceeded, and partly to make good the deficiency in the aggregate amount of court fees caused by simplifying the practice of the courts.

The excessive expenditure in the erection of the courts and offices has arisen from the control having been taken out of the hands of the body originally intended to be intrusted with the superintendence of the works, and from the alterations made in the plans, and the great delay in the completion of the buildings.

The Chancery Suitors' Fund contributed in 1865 a million in Consols to the cost of these courts and offices, and under the provisions of the Courts of Law Fees Act, 1867, and the Courts of Justice Salaries and Funds Act, 1869, large funds in cash and stock, amounting to several millions, which had accumulated from unclaimed suitors' money and banking profits made by the use of the suitors' funds, and from unclaimed dividends on bankrupts' and insolvents' estates, and unapplied court fees, have been appropriated by the Treasury and the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt.

Some of these funds were charged with book debts representing the aggregate amount of cash belonging to suitors' and bankrupts' estates, and others of them were charged with certain salaries and pensions; but, after paying or providing for all these charges, there has been a very large surplus, as is shown by the accounts presented by the Treasury to Parliament in pursuance of the Acts 30 & 31 Vict. c. 122, s. 4, and 38 & 39 Vict. c. 77, s. 28.

From the account (No. 229) presented for the year ending March 31st, 1883, and printed by order of the House of Commons on the 28th of June, 1883, it appears that the net amounts of the dividends or interest which would have arisen from the stock transferred by the Court of Chancery and the Court of Bankruptcy to the National Debt Commissioners, under the Courts of Justice (Salaries and Funds) Act, 1869, and from the stock purchased with cash so transferred after deducting the amount of stock in Consols represented by payments from the Exchequer in aid of the cash balances of the Paymaster of the Court of Chancery and Accountant in Bankruptcy, were as follow:—

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Court of Chancery Dividends . . . . .	104,052	13	8			
Representing a sum of Three per Cent. Consols . . . . .				3,564,974	8	6
Court of Bankruptcy Dividends . . . . .	41,259	16	4			
Representing Consols . . . . .				1,413,612	10	2
Total Dividends . . . . .	£145,312	10	0			
Total Consols . . . . .				£4,978,586	18	8

The total cost of the courts and offices, including interest on the Treasury advances, appears to have been £2,083,756, while the sums in Consols and cash transferred by the Courts of Chancery and Bankruptcy

represent nearly five millions in Consols, to which must be added the million in Consols taken from the Chancery Suits' Funds in 1865; so that altogether the suitors in the Courts of Chancery and Bankruptcy have contributed nearly six millions in Consols towards the cost of building the law courts and offices, and the current expenses of the administration of justice.

Under the Courts of Justice Building Act of 1865, the "rent of courts fee" was to be calculated on an estimated expenditure of £300,000 beyond the million in Consols then taken from the Chancery Suits' Fund, and £200,000 proposed to be contributed by the Treasury for the erection of the courts. The fee was to continue for a period of not more than fifty years, and the chancery suitors were to be relieved from any contribution to it.

The Court of Chancery having since been amalgamated with the other courts, it is practically impossible to raise the rent of courts fee exclusively from the suitors in the other branches of the High Court; but, notwithstanding the large funds which, under the Act of 1869, have been since taken from the chancery and bankruptcy suitors' funds, beyond the million taken in 1865, the rent of courts fee is by the proposed Bill fixed in perpetuity as £17,500 per annum; and this rent, together with the whole cost incurred in the administration of justice (excluding the salaries and retiring pensions of the Lord Chancellor and judges, and after crediting the dividends which would have arisen from the suitors' funds transferred under the Act of 1869), is thrown on the suitors, who can only be relieved at intervals of three or perhaps five years, and then only when the fees levied are found to have been in excess of the net expenses and of the rent, £17,500 per annum.

According to the figures given in the account already referred to, not only is any such reduction highly improbable, but it appears certain that, if the Bill passes in its present form, the court fees must be very largely increased at the end of five years, in order to meet the deficiency in the receipts to defray the net expenses and rent.

It is not necessary for the present purpose to contend that the expenses incurred in the administration of justice should be wholly defrayed by the public, and not by the suitors; but, when the suitors' funds have already defrayed the whole of the cost of building the courts and offices, and left a large surplus for the benefit of the public, it is unjust that the suitors should be required to pay a rent of £17,500 per annum for the use of buildings, the erection of which has, in effect, been already paid for out of their own funds, and that they should be taxed in order to make up a deficiency caused by efforts to simplify the practice of the courts and reduce the cost of litigation.

## LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JAMES FRANCIS GARRICK, barrister, has been appointed to act as Agent-General in England for the Colony of Queensland. Mr. Garrick was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1873. He is a member of the Legislative Council of Queensland, and he has been for some time Postmaster-General for the colony.

Mr. Justice STEPHEN has received the Honorary Degree of LL.D. from the University of Edinburgh.

Mr. HENRY CORBETT JONES, solicitor, of 41, New Oxford-street, has been elected Clerk to the St. Giles's District Board of Works. Mr. Jones was admitted a solicitor in 1881.

Mr. ROBERT HAWTHORN COLLINS, barrister, C.B., has been created a Civil Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath. Sir R. Collins is the son of the Rev. John Ferdinand Collins, and was born in 1841. He was educated at Marlborough College, and he was formerly scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in Law and Modern History in 1863. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1865, and he formerly practised in the Court of Chancery. In 1874 he was appointed comptroller of the household of the late Duke of Albany, to whom he had previously been private tutor. He was created a Civil Companion of the Order of the Bath in 1874.

Mr. WILLIAM DUTHOIT, barrister, D.C.L., has been appointed Judicial Commissioner of Oudh. Mr. Duthoit is a D.C.L. of Exeter College, Oxford, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in January, 1884. He is a member of the Bengal Civil Service, and he has been for some time Judicial Commissioner of Coorg.

Mr. DOUGLAS STRAIGHT, one of the judges of the High Court at Allahabad, has been appointed to act as Chief Justice of the North-West Provinces of India. Mr. Justice Straight is the son of Mr. Robert Marshall Straight, and was born in 1844. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1865. He formerly practised on the South-Eastern Circuit, and also at the Surrey Sessions and the Central Criminal Court. From 1870 till 1874 he was M.P. for Shrewsbury in the Conservative interest, and in 1875 he was a commissioner for inquiring into corrupt practices in the borough of Boston. He was for a short time one of the prosecuting counsel to the Treasury at the Central Criminal Court, and in 1878 he was appointed a judge of the High Court at Allahabad.

Mr. EDWARD WALTER HUNNYBUN, solicitor, of Huntingdon, Thrapston, and Oundle, has been appointed Clerk to the Godmanchester Charity Trustees, in succession to his father, the late Mr. Martin Hunnybun. Mr. E. W. Hunnybun was admitted a solicitor in 1871. He is clerk to the Huntingdon Board of Guardians.

Mr. CHARLES EDMUND FOX, barrister, has been appointed to officiate as Government Advocate for British Burmah. Mr. Fox was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in January, 1877.

Mr. ALAN MACLEAN SKINNER, barrister, has been appointed to act as Colonial Secretary of the Straits Settlements. Mr. Skinner is the son of Mr. Alan Maclean Skinner, Q.C., recorder of Windsor. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Trinity Term, 1867. He has been for some time colonial treasurer at Singapore.

Mr. JOHN GREENFIELD, solicitor (of the firm of Greenfield & Abbott), of 37, Queen Victoria-street, has been appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor a Commissioner for taking Affidavits to be used in the Courts of Records in the Province for Quebec, Canada.

Mr. W. MELLOWS, solicitor, Peterborough, has been appointed Town Clerk of that city.

The Hon. WALTER FRANCIS HELY HUTCHINSON, C.M.G., barrister, has been appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the Island of Malta. Mr. Hutchinson is the second son of the fourth Earl of Donoughmore, and was born in 1849. He was educated at Harrow, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in November, 1877. He was colonial secretary for Barbadoes from 1877 till 1883, when he was appointed chief secretary to the Government of Malta.

Mr. HENRY HARTLEY FOWLER, M.P. (of the firm of Corser, Fowler, & Langley), of Wolverhampton, and of 147, Leadenhall-street, has been appointed a Commissioner to inquire into the Supply of Stationery to the Government Departments.

Mr. H. A. PATIENCE, solicitor, of No. 120, Cheapside, London, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

## DISSOLUTIONS OF PARTNERSHIPS, &c.

DANIEL FREDERICK EDWARD SYKES and JOHN BLANCHARD JUBB, solicitors, Huddersfield and Slaithwaite (Edwin Sykes & Son). April 4. So far as regards the said John Blanchard Jubb.

JOHN BAILEY HOLROYDE, HORACE MELVILLE SMITH, and WILLIAM HENRY LAND, solicitors, Halifax (Holroyde, Smith, & Land). April 2.

JAMES SMITH HEPBURN, WILLIAM ARNOLD HEPBURN, and GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, jun., solicitors, Bird-in-Hand-court, 76, Cheapside, London (Hepburn, Sons, & Cutcliffe). So far as regards the said William Arnold Hepburn. The said James Smith Hepburn and George Cutcliffe, jun., will continue the said practice under the style of Hepburn, Son, & Cutcliffe.

FREDERICK ROGERS TIDD-PRATT and HUGH POWEL DAVIES, solicitors, Kingston (Tidd-Pratt & Davies). March 31. [Gazette, April 18.]

JOHN GOODACRE STRICKLAND and EDWARD STRICKLAND, solicitors, Bristol. December 31, 1883. [Gazette, April 22.]

Mr. GEORGE ARTHUR ROOKS (Rooks & Co.), of 16, King-street, Cheapside, has admitted into partnership with him Mr. Spiers, Mr. Martin, Mr. Banks, and Mr. Wales (all of whom have been with him as clerks for a considerable time). The business will continue to be carried on by the new firm under the same style of "Rooks & Co."

## LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

April 21.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILL.—Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Water, &c.

*Bill Read a Third Time.*

PRIVATE BILL.—Rickmansworth Water.

April 22.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILL.—North Sea Fisheries (East Lincolnshire) Harbour and Dock.

Army (Annual).

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 21.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—Lea-bridge, Leyton, and Walthamstow Tramways Extensions; Ouse (Lower) Improvement; South Stockton Local Board; Tees Conservancy; West Cheshire Water.

Public Health (Confirmation of Bye-Laws); Marriage Legalization (Wood-green Congregational Church).

*Bills Read a Third Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—Birkenhead Corporation; Boulton's Patent; Bradbury and Lomax's Patent; Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Docks; London Tramways; Totnes, Paignton, and Torquay Direct Railway.

April 22.—*Bills Read a Second Time.*

Real Assets Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Rotherham and Bawtry Railway; Croydon, Norwood, Dulwich, and London Railway; London Eastern Tramways.

*Bills Read a Third Time.*

PRIVATE BILLS.—Henley-in-Arden and Great Western Junction Railway; Leicester Corporation; Porthdinleyn Railway; Sutton and Willoughby Railway.



April 23.—Bills Read a Second Time.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Trent Navigation; Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2).

## New Bills.

Bill to provide for ascertaining any rights of common or other rights in or over Strensall Common, in the North Riding of the county of York, and for the acquisition and compensation of such rights, and the use of the said common and adjoining land for military purposes (Mr. BRAND).

Bill to make better provision for the making, assessment, and collection of municipal rates (Mr. COWEN).

## LEGAL NEWS.

In the course of the trial on Wednesday last of John Ross, at the Central Criminal Court, for setting fire to his house, Mr. Geoghegan, in addressing the jury for the defence, expressed his regret that by a recent rule of the judges the prisoner had not been allowed to give his own version of the matter. Mr. Justice Stephen said that if the learned counsel had asked him to let the prisoner tell his own story he would have allowed him directly, and if Mr. Geoghegan liked to sit down he would do so then. The decision of the judges to which the learned counsel had referred was that counsel were not allowed to make themselves witnesses for a reason which anyone who occupied the position of counsel would at once appreciate—namely, that in giving evidence they could not help being advocates. If the prisoner wished it, he could make a statement then. The prisoner thereupon addressed the jury, urging that the fire had been caused, not by his act, but by the hand of a man he had employed occasionally, who also took the policy of insurance and some valuables. Mr. Justice Stephen said that when a prisoner was allowed to make a statement he thought—and it was also the opinion of Mr. Justice Cave, who had acted upon it on circuit—that it gave a reply to counsel for the Crown if they thought proper to take the opportunity. Mr. Geoghegan then again addressed the jury, urging that there was no motive shown for the commission of the offence by the prisoner, who was not in needy circumstances, and that the incidents were so obscure that it would be unsafe to convict the prisoner. Mr. Poland replied for the prosecution; and, after the learned judge had summed up, the jury convicted the prisoner.

At the first meeting of creditors in the bankruptcy of Messrs. Parker on the 18th inst., Mr. Whinney, one of the trustees, reported the result of the investigation so far as he, in conjunction with Mr. Turquand, had been able to make it. They ascertained that the books of the firm had not been properly made up for about five years, although they contained entries relating to current business, and it was difficult, therefore, to form an estimate in reference to the debts. From the claims which had come in, however, it appeared that the liabilities, taken approximately, amounted to about £1,100,000. Of these, there were creditors for about half a million holding securities, the value of which had not yet been ascertained; and, with regard to the assets, he feared they were small, and depended in some measure upon the result of the investigation of the securities claimed by creditors. Their time as special managers had been very much occupied in the examination of deeds and securities, and so far as could be ascertained, they had been delivered to the persons entitled to them. It appeared that the legitimate business of the firm was a very good one, the profits averaging from £10,000 to £12,000 per year, and increasing latterly to about £15,000, and the failure was caused by the improvident and even insane manner in which the bankrupts had invested money. They had made investments in three hotels, in a paint factory, a linoleum factory, a contractors' business, and gas works, and a very large sum had been put into property at Ramsgate and Westgate, the total outlay being something like £700,000.

## COURT PAPERS.

## SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

## ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	V. O. BACON.	Mr. Justice KAY.
Monday, April .....	28 Mr. Jackson	Mr. King	Mr. Kee
Tuesday .....	29 Cobby	Merivale	Clowes
Wednesday .....	30 Jackson	King	Kee
Thursday, May .....	1 Cobby	Merivale	Clowes
Friday .....	2 Jackson	King	Kee
Saturday .....	3 Cobby	Merivale	Clowes
	Mr. Justice CHITTY.	Mr. Justice NORTH.	Mr. Justice FRANKSON.
Monday, April .....	28 Mr. Lavie	Mr. Farrer	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday .....	29 Carrington	Teeddale	Ward
Wednesday .....	30 Lavie	Farrer	Pemberton
Thursday, May .....	1 Carrington	Teeddale	Ward
Friday .....	2 Lavie	Farrer	Pemberton
Saturday .....	3 Carrington	Teeddale	Ward

## EASTER SITTINGS, 1884.

## COURT OF APPEAL.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Chancery, Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions (Probate and Divorce), the London Bankruptcy Court, and the County Palatine and Stannaries Courts.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Tuesday, Apr. 23	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure)
Wednesday .. 23	{ Interlocutory apps contin., and apps from general list if required
Thursday .. 24	{ Apps from the general list
Friday .. 25	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Saturday .. 26	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 27	{ Apps. from the general list
Tuesday .. 28	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Wednesday .. 29	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday, May 1	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 2	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Sat. .. 3	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 4	{ Apps. from the general list
Tues. .. 5	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Wednesday .. 6	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday .. 7	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Friday .. 8	{ Apps. from the general list
Saturday .. 9	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 10	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 11	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 12	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Thursday .. 13	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 14	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 15	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 16	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 17	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 18	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Thursday .. 19	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 20	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 21	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 22	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 23	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 24	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Thursday .. 25	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 26	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 27	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 28	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 29	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 30	{ Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Thursday .. 31	{ Apps. from the general list

N.B.—Lunacy Petitions are taken in Appeal Court II, on every Saturday at half-past ten during the sittings.

## Appeal Court, I.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Queen's Bench Division, and from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division (Admiralty).

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Tuesday, Apr. 23	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Wednesday .. 23	{ Interlocutory apps contin.
Thursday .. 24	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 25	{ Apps. from the general list
Saturday .. 26	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 27	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 28	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 29	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday, May 1	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 2	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 3	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 4	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 5	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 6	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday .. 7	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 8	{ Apps. from the general list
Saturday .. 9	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 10	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 11	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 12	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday .. 13	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 14	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 15	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 16	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 17	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 18	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday .. 19	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 20	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 21	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 22	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 23	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 24	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday .. 25	{ Apps. from the general list
Friday .. 26	{ Apps. from the general list
Sat. .. 27	{ Apps. from the general list
Monday .. 28	{ App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns (procedure) and also apps from general list if required
Tuesday .. 29	{ Apps. from the general list
Wednesday .. 30	{ Apps. from the general list
Thursday .. 31	{ Apps. from the general list

Wednesday 14 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thurs. .... 15 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 16 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 17 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 18 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 19 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 20 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 21 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 22 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 23 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 24 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 25 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 26 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 27 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 28 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 29 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 30 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 31 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 32 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 33 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 34 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 35 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 36 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 37 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 38 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 39 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 40 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 41 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 42 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 43 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 44 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 45 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 46 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 47 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 48 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 49 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 50 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 51 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 52 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 53 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 54 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 55 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 56 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 57 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 58 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 59 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 60 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 61 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 62 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 63 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 64 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 65 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 66 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 67 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 68 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 69 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 70 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 71 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 72 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 73 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 74 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 75 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 76 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 77 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 78 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 79 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 80 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 81 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 82 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 83 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 84 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 85 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 86 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 87 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 88 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 89 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 90 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 91 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 92 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 93 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 94 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 95 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 96 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 97 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 98 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 99 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 100 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 101 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 102 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 103 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 104 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 105 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 106 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 107 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 108 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 109 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 110 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 111 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 112 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 113 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 114 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 115 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 116 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 117 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 118 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 119 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 120 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Tuesday .. 121 { Apps. from the general list

Wednesday .. 122 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Thursday .. 123 { Apps. from the general list

Friday .. 124 { App. motns. ex pte—orgl. motns.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory motns and also apps. from general list if required.

Sat. .... 125 { Apps. from the general list

Monday .. 126

In re Saml Taylor deed Illsey v Randall appl of S T. Fraser & anr from Mr Justice Pearson May 31  
Spraggett v Spraggett and ors appl of W Newton and anr from Mr Justice Pearson May 31  
Kenist v The Great Eastern Ry Co appl of p'ts from the judgt of Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson June 5  
In re Lewis Solomon deed Levy v Jacobs appl of H Hart from Mr Justice Kay June 12  
In re Estates at Swanton, settled by will of C R Jones and S E Act 1882 appl of Henry de la Dillwyn from V C Bacon June 13  
In re The Dronfield Silketone Coal Cold & C's Acts appl of Messrs Overend & Barker & ors from Mr Justice Chitty June 19  
Boswell v Coaks appl of Pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Fry June 19  
In re The Brighton Livery Stables Cold and Co's Acts (ex parte Joseph Offord) appl of Joseph Offord (a Contributory) from V C Bacon June 19  
Buitool & anr v Grepe & ors Grepe & ors v Loam appl of John Stanley Grepe and ors from judgt of V C Bacon June 21  
Barlow v Vestry of St Mary Abbots Kensington appl of Deft Vestry from V C Bacon June 28  
In re W James deed James v James appl of Deft from V C Bacon June 29  
Ritson v Harrison Harrison v Ritson appl of Deft Rooke Pennington from V C County Palatine of Lancaster June 30  
Ada Howarth Ptnr v James Waloh Howarth Respt appl of Respt from decre nial for dissolution of marriage pronounced by Mr Justice Butt dated May 30 July 3  
Smyth-Pigott v Smyth-Pigott appl of Deft E F Smyth-Pigott from judgt of Mr Justice Fry July 4  
Henrichs v Westinghouse appl of plt in person from refusal of Mr Justice Kay July 7  
In re The Colorado Mines Development Co, limd, and Co's Acts appl of Robert Tennant from Mr Justice Kay July 11  
In re T E March, deed, Mander v Harris appl of plt from order of Mr Justice Chitty allowing demurrer July 11  
Espr v Mainwaring appl of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson July 12  
In re Charles Augustus Wright, a solicitor (expte Jerome Saccone and anr appl of C A Wright from Mr Justice Chitty July 13  
In re Bentley-Innes, deceased Bentley-Innes v Bentley-Innes appl of R C Millar from Mr Justice North July 14  
Nordon v Nordon appl of deft Maurice Nordon from Mr Justice Chitty July 20  
In re the Corecum Gold Mining Co of India, limd and Co's Ae's appl of James Wilson from Mr Justice Chitty dismissing Petn to wind up Co July 21  
In re T B Illidge, deed Davidson v Illidge appl of Henry Sapple from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty July 21  
In re T B Illidge, deed Davidson v Illidge appl of T B Illidge from Mr Justice Chitty July 21  
In re The Artistic Colour Printing Co, limd, and Co's Acts (Chappell's Case) appl of Liquidator from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty July 23  
Rust v The Victoria Graving Dock Co appl of the Victoria Graving Dock Co from Mr Justice Field for Mr Justice Kay July 25  
Rust v The Victoria Graving Dock Co appl of London & St Katharine Dock Co from Mr Justice Field for Mr Justice Kay July 25  
Norton & Eocher, on behalf, &c v Compton (Piper's Claim) appl of H E Piper from refusal of Mr Justice Pearson July 25  
In re The General Financial Bank limd & C's Acts (Richardson's Case) appl of Joseph Richardson from V C Bacon Aug 2  
In re The White Star Consolidated Gold Mining Co limd and Co's Acts appl of Edward Beale from winding-up order made by V C Bacon Aug 2  
Jones and anr v The Great Eastern Ry Co appl of deft. from judgt of V C Bacon Aug 2  
In re a Contract for Sale between Charles Adams and the Vestry of St Mary Abbots, Kensington and V & P Act 1874 appl of Charles Adams from Mr Justice Pearson Aug 3  
In re The Alliance Bcy (in Voluntary Liquidation) & Co's Act, 1863 appl of R C Godfray from Mr Justice Kay Aug 3  
Hemberow v Frost appl of deft from judgt of V C Bacon Aug 3  
In re Susan Brown deed O'Halloran v King appl of pliffs from Mr Justice Kay Aug 7  
Hays v Gardener appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North and notice of contention by pliff Aug 10  
Leyland and Co v Vaughan (Liverpool D R) appl of pliffs from judgt of Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Chitty Aug 10  
The 110th Star-Berkett Benefit Building Society v Chapman appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Fry Aug 11  
In re Joseph Timperon, deed and of money standing to the credit of certain Ry Cos—"The account of parties entitled in remainder" appl of Richard Gaus and ors from V C Bacon Aug 13  
In re J H Bell, deed Lake v Bell appl of J B Parker from Mr Justice Chitty disallowing creditors' claim Aug 13  
In re The Cornwall Minerals Ry Co and Co's Act 1867 (Claim of Newquay and Cornwall Junction Ry Co) appl of the Newquay, &c, Co from Mr Justice Kay dismissing claim Aug 13  
In re John Maddover, deed Three Towns Bkg Co limd v Maddover appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice North Aug 13  
In re Contract between John Morley and W B Cowman for Sale of Freehold Property in Cumberland & V & P Act, 1874 appl of W B Cowman from a Mr Justice Chitty Aug 13  
In re The North Wales Freehold Copper Mines and Smelting Co ll and Co's Ae's appl of R. M. Fabris from Mr Justice North Aug 14  
Smith v Land and House Property Corporation, limd appl of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North Aug 15  
Alt v Norman appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice North Aug 17  
Chatterley v Nicholls appl of plt from judgt of Mr Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson Aug 21  
Charlton v Rolleston, and In re Swindon, Marlboro' and Andover Ry Acts, 1873 and 1879 and Lands Clauses Acts, 1845 and 1849 appl of Swindon, &c Ry Co from order of Mr Justice Kay Aug 23  
In re The Silver Peak Mining Co limd and Co's Acts (W C Cooper's case) appl of the Co from order of Mr Justice Kay Aug 23  
Weston v Sherwell appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North Aug 28  
Sharp v Allen and Sons appl of deft from order of V C B Sept 1



*Clather v Twiden* app of dft from part of judgment of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North Sept 3  
*In re The International Marine Hydropathic Co Ltd and Co's Acts and Lancaster Acts, 1850 and 1854* app of official liquidator from V C County Palatine of Lancaster Sept 3  
*In re Nation, dect Nation v Hamilton* app of plt from V C Bacon Sept 7  
*Sedgove v Pullinger* app of dfts Pullinger and anr from Mr Justice Chitty Sept 7  
*Sayers v Collyer* app of plt and dfts British Land Co from Mr Justice Pearson Sept 16  
*In re Joseph Wright & Co. lmd. & Co's Acts* app of Thos Barnaley and ors from Mr Justice Chitty Sept 25  
*In re Joseph Wright & Co lmd* app of Saml Amplett from Mr Justice Chitty Sept 25  
*In re Joseph Wright & Co lmd* appl of Thos Hall, a director, from Mr Justice Chitty—set down by order  
*In re R Parker, the elder, dect Parker v Parker* app of pits from Mr Justice Pearson Sept 26  
*Young v Wallingford* app of dfts from V C Bacon Oct 4  
*In re The Midtler borough, Redcar, Saltburn-by-the-Sea, &c. Building Society & Co's Acts* app of John Donham from Mr Justice Pearson Oct 6  
*In re The Duchy Mining Co ld & Co's Acts* app of W R Hutton and ors (hdra) from Vice Warden of the Stannaries Oct 19  
*In re The Paragon Brick Tile and Cement Works Co ld and Co's Acts* app of Petrus from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty Oct 26  
*The Badische Anilin and Soda Fabrik v Levinstein* appl of Dfts from Mr Justice Pearson Oct 31  
*Paohett v Illingworth* appl of Dfts from V C Bacon Nov 5  
 (To be continued.)

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.  
 For Judgment.

*Brunden v Humphrys* app of plt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes—(o a v Feb 12—present the Lord Chief Justice, Master of the Rolls, and Lord Justice Bowen)  
*Hollins & Co v Verney Bart & ors* app of dfts from the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Denman and Manisty—c a v Feb 19, present Master of the Rolls, and Lord Justice Lindley and Bowen  
*Ship, City of Chester The Owners, Master and Crew of the Missuri v The Owners of the City of Chester, her cargo, specie and freight* app of pits from judgment and rejection of evidence by Mr Justice Butt—c a v Feb 28, present Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Baggallay and Lindley  
 For Hearing.

1882.

*Salberg, Bros & Co v Moore* appl of pits from the Lord Chief Justice and Lord Justice Brett (sitting as a Divisional Court) sitting aside verdict obtained in Shoreditch County Court Aug 18

1883.

*The Silver Hill Mining Co v Bridge* appl of Pltff from ju'gt of Mr Justice Grove on claim and counter claim at trial at Bristol Ma ch 14

*Rees v Quenorden Aine* appl of dft from judgment of the Master of the Rolls at trial at Glamorgan April 13

*Higham & ors v The Fallsworth Industrial Co-operative Society lmd* app of pits from judgment of Mr Justice Day at trial in Manchester June 7

*Evans & anr v Soames & Co* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Day at trial at Liverpool June 27

*Dye v Dye & anr* app of plt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes directing entry of judgment for dfts on special ois: stated by parties July 3

*Christie v Barker (Q B Crown Side)* app of dft from judgment of Justices Williams and A L Smith dismissing app July 7

*Andrews (Trustee) v Wild & ors* appl of pliff from judgment of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in London July 9

*Hovess v Prudential Assurance Co, lmd, and Hovess* app of dft Hovess from judgment of Mr Justice Lopes after trial in Middlesex July 13 (security ordered)

*Blott v Smith* app of dft from judgment of Baron Huddleston at trial at Bedford July 20

*Jenkinson v Rothery and ors* app of dft Stevenson from judgment of Mr Justice Williams at trial July 31

*Jenkinson v Rothery and ors* app of dfts Rothery, Mankwell, and Spencer from judgment of Mr Justice Williams after trial at Leeds Aug 3

*Addison v Pether and Son* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex Aug 1

*Ship Winston Owners of the Warwick Castle v Owners of the Winston* appl of pliffs from judgment of the President Aug 2 (without Assessor)

*The Queen v The Assessment Committee of the Poplar Union (1a re Bromley and St Leonard's Supplemental List—Q B Crown Side)*

*The Queen v The same Committee (1a re All Saints, Poplar, Supplemental List app of the East and West India Dock Co (Prosecutors) from judgment of Mr Justice Grove and Manisty in each case quashing order of Assessment Session)* Aug 3

*McDonald v Tacquah Gold Mines Co lmd* app of dfts from judgment of Lord Justice Baggallay at trial at Maidstone and Hertford Aug 3

*Hulden v The Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough of Oldham* appl of plt from judgment of Mr Justice Williams after trial at Liverpool Aug 4

*Jones and anr v The Mayor, &c., of the Borough of Oldham* appl of pits from judgment of Mr Justice Williams at trial at Liverpool Aug 4

*Dorman v Goodchild and ors* appl of plt from judgment of Mr Justice Stephen on Referee's report Aug 4

*Ship Notting Hill Cloaks & ors The Owners of the Notting Hill* appl of pliffs from order of the President overruling objection to Registrar's report Aug 4

*The Queen v The Guardians of the Poor of the Parish of St Marylebone, Middlesex (Q B Crown Side)* appl of dfts from judgment of Justices Williams and A. L. Smith confirming order of Justices and Sessions on case stated Aug 11

*Garrod v Hollis* app of dft from Justices Field and Williams reviving Exchequer judgment obtained in 1869 with liberty to issue execution Aug 11

*Brown v Briggs* appl of plt from judgment of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex Aug 14

*Lennard v Gilmour* app of dft from judgment of Lord Justice Lindley at trial at Swansea Aug 21 security ordered

*Mitchell v Smith* app of dft from judgment of Mr Justice Cave at trial at Leeds Aug 29

*Steamship "Sir Fox" Co lmd v Liverpool Barrow and West Cumberland Steamship Co lmd* app of pits from judgment of C Crompton, Esq, QC, Commar at trial at Liverpool Sept 14 security ordered

*French (substituted for Rogers, Gunn, & Co by order) v Wilt* app of plt from judgment of Mr Justice Stephen at trial Oct 18

*Ship Heinrich Bjorn C & C J Northcote v Owners of the Heinrich Bjorn* appl of dfts from judgment of the President Nov 6 (without Assessor)

*J B Cramer & Co v Giles & Chilton* appl of dft Carlton from judgment of Mr Justice Lopes at trial Nov 16

*Eriksson & ors (Owners of the Donatus v Wade & ors)* appl of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Day at trial at York Nov 19

*Read v Anderson* appl of dft from judgment of Mr Justice Hawkins on far conson Nov 20

*Thorpe v Reneson* appl of dft from judgment of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial in Middlesex Nov 22

*Hutcheson & Co v Easton & Co* appl of pliffs from judgment of Mr Justice Hawkins after trial at Liverpool Nov 27

*Foulkes v Quartz Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co lmd* appl of pliff from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial in Middlesex Nov 27

*The Anglo-American Metal Buyers Agency v The Railway Equipment Co of New York* appl of pliffs from judgment of Justices Day and A L Smith Nov 28

*Ross v Ashwin & snr* appl of dft Ivory from part of judgment of Mr Justice Mathew Nov 29

*The Queen v The Guardians of the Poor of the Headington Union, Oxford and Buckingham (Q B Crown Side)* appl of dfts from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Mathew affirming order of Justices Nov 29

*Claridge v Kemp & anr (Lewis & Bailey, claimants)* a pl of claimants from judgment of Justices Grove and A L Smith Dec 4

*Wm Duck v J C Bates (Q B Crown Side)* appl of pliff from judgment of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Stephen on appl from County Court Dec 4

*Scharlack v Haines (sued as Haines & Co)* appl of dft from judgment of Mr Justice A L Smith at trial Dec 6

*The Mayor &c of the Borough of St Helens v The St Helens Collieries Co lmd* appl of dft Co from judgment of Justices Day & A L Smith on special case Dec 6

*The West London Commercial Bank lmd v Kiteon* appl of dfts Kiteon and Porter from judgment of Justices Day & A L Smith Dec 10

*Merrett & anr v Bridges* appl of pliffs from judgment of Justices Day and A L Smith on special case Dec 12

*Municipal Freehold Land Co v The Metropolitan District Railway Co* appl of pliff Co from judgment of Mr Justice Cave at trial Dec 12

*Ship "Peggie Day" Read & ors v Dawson* appl of owners of "Peggie Day" from judgment of Mr Justice Butt (without Assessor) Dec 12

*Ship "Warkworth" The Tyne Steam Shipping Co lmd v The British Ship Owners Co lmd* appl of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Butt (without Assessor) Dec 14

*Carter v Rocks* appl of dft from judgment of Mr Justice Watkin Williams at trial in Middlesex Dec 19

*Thomas Dinning, Appellant v The Guardians of the South Shields Poor Law Union (Q B Crown Side)* appl of respondents from Justices Stephen and Mathew (the Lord Chief Justice dissenting) confirming order of Magistrates for contribution to support wife Dec 21

*Palmer v Johnson* appl of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice A L Smith after trial at Nottingham Dec 21

1884.

*Wakelin v The London and South Western Railway Co* appeal of pliff from Mr Justice Grove, Baron Huddleston and Mr Justice Hawkins setting aside verdict for pliff at trial before Mr Justice Manisty and giving judgment for dft Jan 1

*G C Melville v John R. Stringer Houghton & ors claimants (Q B Crown Side)* appl of pliff from judgment of Justices Mathew, Day, and A. L. Smith on appl from County Court Jan 2

*J E Morgan v London General Omnibus Co lmd (Q B Crown Side)* appl of pliff from Justices Day and A L Smith on appl from County Court for new trial Jan 2

*The Queen v West Bromwich School Board (Q B Crown Side)* appl of dfts from the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Stephen and Mathew confirming order of Sessions Jan 3

*White v D Baxter & Co* appl of pliff from judgment of Mr Justice Watkin Williams at trial in London Jan 3

*Pecket & anr v Short Bros* appl of pliffs from Mr Justice Grove, Baron Huddleston and Mr Justice Hawkins refusing to restore judgment of Mr Justice Cave with costs Jan 3

*Gliddon (trustee, &c) v Broderick, Vaughan & Co* appl of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Cave at trial in London Jan 4

*Wright (trustee, &c) v Watson & Dickons* appl of dfts from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial in Middlesex Jan 5

*Sanderson v The Mayor &c of Berwick upon Tweed* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Denman after trial at Newcastle Jan 8

*The Manchester and Oldham Bank ld v W A Cooke and Co* app of pits from judgment of Justices Day and A L Smith on special case stated by arbitrator Jan 8

*Andrews (trading &c) v Sargeant, Longstaff & Co* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Denman at trial in London Jan 12

*Raymont v McNeill* app of dft from Justices Manisty, Lopes and Watkin Williams refusing to set aside Referee's Report Jan 17

*Dolman v Davis* app of dft from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial in Middlesex Jan 18

*Mitchell (an infant &c) v The Darlar Main Colliery Co* app of plt from judgment of Mr Justice Hawkins after trial at York, W R Jan 19

*Kiteon & Co v The Blackburn and Over Darwen Tramway Co* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Pearson after trial Jan 21

*The Metropolitan Bd of Works v The Local Bd of Willesden* app of pits from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial in Middlesex Jan 30

*Wing v Barnacle* app of plt from judgment of Mr Justice North at trial Feb 5

*Baker v Murray* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Cave at trial in London Feb 6

*Hetherington v Groome* app of dft from judgment of Mr Justice Hawkins at trial in Middlesex Feb 8

*Lambert Bros & Colling v Barker and anr* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Day at trial at Newcastle Feb 8

*Burgess v Clark and anr* app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Cave at trial in Wilshire Feb 8

In re Heath and The Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England app of Heath from order of Justice Manley and Watkin Williams Feb 8  
 Wheeler v The United Telephone Co, lmd app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Watkin Williams at trial in Middlesex Feb 12  
 Harding and anr v Fowler and anr app of defts The York, &c, Banking Co from judgt of Baron Pollock at trial Feb 15  
 Swinhoe v Birnie app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day at Darham Feb 18  
 Peaks v Whitehurst app of plt from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial at Stafford Feb 19  
 Gillard v The Cheshire Lines Committee app of defts from judgt of Lord Justice Baggallay at Liverpool Feb 20  
 Barclay v Wheatley app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex Feb 20

(To be continued.)

## HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

## CHANCERY DIVISION.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1884.

Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to Thursday, April 17th, inclusive.)

N.B.—During the absence of Mr Justice North on the Spring Circuit the Business of his Lordship's Court will be taken by Mr. Justice DENMAN, who will sit in Mr. Justice NORTH's Court (Chancery Court II.), and take the Actions in the usual order.

A Transfer of 80 Witness Actions—viz., 60 from Mr. Justice PEARSON, and 20 from Mr. Justice CHITTY, was made by order, dated April 12th, to Mr. Justice NORTH, and will be taken in due order after the Actions previously transferred and remaining for Trial.

A Transfer of Chancery Actions to the Queen's Bench Division was made on March 25th. They will be found placed in the List of Queen's Bench Actions without Juries, which can be seen in the Associate's Department.

The order in which the Business will be taken by the several Judges of the Chancery Division will be found particularly stated in the Easter Sittings Paper, and will also appear in shorter form in the Daily Cause List.

Before Vice-Chancellor BACON.  
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

Hardy v Wilmot act wits pt hd

In re M E Anstie, Chatwynd v Morgan act & m f j

Winter v Ind Coope & Co act wits

Brown v Black act wits

Belcher v Belcher act In re T O

Lomax, Whitehead v Lomax act

Balcombe v Sawtell act

Bugiovanni v La Socié & Generale act wits

Haves v Haves act & m f j wits

In re J Highmore act wits

Hunter v Barnes act

Probert v Windus act wits

Crisp v City of London Publishing C act

Pentherne v Henderson act & m f

Thuey v Denn's act wits

Ayling v Mercer act wits

In re Gallop United Ports & Co v Gallop act & m f j wits

Phelps, Stokes & Co v Comber act wits

Snowden Slate Quarries Co v Griffith act Clothworkers' Co v Hutchison act wits pt hd

Harvey v Oliver act wits

Davies v Davies m f j

Morley v Weigel act wits

Boujeaud v Martin act wits

Working Men's & Co Society v Reynolds act wits

Pil v Pile m f j

Kerber v Strachan act

Pratt v Walsh act

Watson v Johnson act & m f j In re

Williamson Williamson v Wright & Co United Telephone Co v London & Globe & Co act wits

Adams v Abercrombie act

Cole v Jones act

In re J Meyrick Hartman Gillett v L w d n s act

Smith v Smith f c

Bickerton v Walker act & m f j

In re Jacks n Owen v Jones act wits

Wilest v Henley motn for judgt

Gatley v Blake motn for judgt

In re Gest Neep v Johnson act wits

Gould v Blich motn for judgt

Walters v Lancashire & Yorkshire Ry Co act wits

Washbourn, & Co v Patterson act wits

Anderson v Macfayden act wits

Anderson v Macfayden act wits

Pughe v Hughes

Weedon v Higgins & Co m f j

Hugh v Evans act wits

Haworth v Williams act & m f j

Macchlehan v Fletcher act & m f j

Langlands v Davis act wits

In re Firmin Lond & Coy Bkg Co v Firmin act wits

Gandy v Gandy act & m f j wits

Alexander v Long act wits

Gliddon v Gliddon act wits

Smith v Smith act wits

Geore v Rouquette act wits

Hobson v Monks act wits

Standard Union Investment Co l d v Isaac act wits

Stuart v Mainwaring act wits

In re Hadden & Co p m wits

Lawson v Vacuum Brake Co l d act wits

Nicholson v Lovering m f j

West London Coml Bk l d v Reliance & Society act wits

Salaman v Ballin acts wits

United Telephone Co l d v London, & Telephone, & Co act

Moore v Willett act

Boyce v Long f c

Ogden v Stamford, & Bk f c

Pagden v Blake act wits

Pritchard v Bristol, & Co Society act wits

Atlee v Dibley f c

In re Mills Bath v Shillocock act & m f j

Cranford v Thomas act

In re Needham Robinson v Needham act wits

Fidoe v Gibson act wits

Dillon v Carter act wits

In re Jerman Jerman v Miller m f j

Peas v Dundas f c

Waters v Waters f c

Frost v Allan f c

Magnus v Lumley act & m f j

In re Harrison Thornburn v Thornburn act

Royal Exchange, & Co v Parr f c

Blake v Summerby act

Merchant Banking Co l d v Quebec Central Ry Co act wits

Evans v Thomas f c

In re Turner Boynton v Tidy f c & sums to vary

Paget v Marshall act wits

Passoe v Rowe act wits

Manton v Talvis act

Nicholls v Nicholls act

Mackenzie v Morris act wits

In re Sowden Sowden v Best f c

In re Duffield Dawson de Coverdale v Cockcroft act

Shingleton v Tippet act wits

In re Double Double v Double f c

Oulton v Whittaker f c

Briggs, Son & Co v Duffier m f j

Brooking v Eldridge m f j (short)

Wetherhead v Flewman act

Roseby v Harcastle act wits

Marquess of Bute v Ryder act & m f j

In re Martin Butterfield v Mott act wits

Economic Benefit, & Co, Society v Tippet m f j (short)

Lingham v Lovering m f j

Nicholson v Lovering m f j

In re Wilmot Vallis v Solly & Co

Beer v Sidworthy m f j

Brandauer & Co v Lindsaybyrne & Co act

In re Davies Heath v Wyand & anr act

Willcombe v Crowe f c (short)

Horne v Board of Works for White-chapel Dist. act wits

Hepburn v Leather m f j (short)

Caedonian Ry Co v Solway June Ry Co act

Franklin v Tannenbaum act wits

Webb v Smith f c

Garnett-Orme v Glossop m f j (short)

In re Watkins Watkins v Williams act wits

In re Watkins Watkins v Williams act wits

Smith v Moody m f j (short)

## Adjourned Summonses

De Mora v Concha pt hd

In re Johnson Hickman v Williamson

Clover v Wills, & Co Building Society

In re Colman Collins v Colman

Kennedy v Lyell

Forrest v Shore

Bennett v Houldsworth

Javenport v King

Peruvian Guano Co v Bookwoldt

In re Mardon Mardon v Swann

In re Haven Gold Mining Co

Smith v Bathany

In re Seventh East Central Building Soc & Co's Acts

In re Nation Nation v Hamilton

In re Wrigley Johnson v Wrigley

Lawson v Vacuum Brakes Co l d

In re Dames & Wood and V & P Act

In re Batty Hardisty v Batty

Day v Reeves

Walter v Moor

In re Courtier Courtier v Coles

In re Courtier Coles v Courtier

Expte Furness Ry Co & Co

McGavin v Dickinson Brown v McCowan

In re Lemm Hewartson v Lemm

Expte Robt Roakrow & Nat Debt Act

Dayfus v Peruvian Guano Co l d

Phillips v Chapman

Shetler v Hare

In re Needham Robinson v Needham

Britannia Fire Assoc v Muroott

In re Docura Docura v Faith

In re Wrigley Johnson v Wrigley

Expte Duke of Marlboro' & Consoli-dated Funds, & Co Act, 1873

## Before Mr. Justice KAY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses.)

Gane v Myers act

Roberts v Oppenheim act

Vasa Murhina Glass Co. lmd v Hill act

Harwood v Blackwell Blackwell v Harwood act pt hd

Lewis v Abardare & Co act & m f j

Baldwin v Hargreaves act pt hd

Snow v Whitehead act pt hd

Russell v Vargues act

The Ropptsweller Stasemaisbahn Gesellschaft v Mulhausen Trams Co l d act

Ellis v Rogers act

Meux v Lord Tweedmouth

Griffith v Equitable Reversionary Interest Socy act

Re Whitworth, Whitworth v Whitworth act

Fau kner v Satterthwaite act

Ansell v Wearing act

Fellows v Jefferies acts

Whitehaven & Co Authority v Smith act

Craddock v Mansel act

Croose v Waller act

Mayor of Plymouth v Martin act

Gilroy v France act

In re Trafford Trafford v Blanc act & m f j

Follard v Taylor act

Maddox v Blackman act

Gorden v Potter act

Boxall v Boxall act

Macraeth v Walmsley act

In re Stainsby Stainsby v Stainsby act

Pearson v Pearson act

In re Pearson, Pearson v Pearson

Peacock v Colling act

Fowler v Holdom act

Peterken v Hamlyn act

In re Heaton's Trade Mark & Co adj sums

Fry v Tapaon act

Cat on v Bunnett act

Harper v Bingley act

Gilmour v Ry & Electric Appliances Co l d act

Henderson v Andrews act

Hobbs v Orlebar act

Ivrens v Ivrens act

In re Hives Reader v Hives act

Hughes v Bywater act

Levick v Statham act

Wilson v Clifton act

Credit Co, l d v Waddle act & m f j

Pillay v Martyn act

Goodall v Harding act

Hardman v Day act

Scott v Matthew, Brown & Co l d act

Haywood v Brunless act

Spratt v Shepherd act

Lawr-noc v Benham act

Speary v Lewis act

Shaw v Warner act

Wilson v Wilson act

Brereton v Mann act

Sayles v Steele act

Wilmot v Bennett act

Derby Land, Building, & Co v Hall act

Watson v Scrimshaw act

Neate v Busby act

St John's Coll, Oxon v Athawes act

Peroni v Hudson act

Grimmer v Chapman act

Fletcher v Gill act

Brown v Milburn & Co act

In re T W Richardson Shillito v Hobson act

Jenkins v Rogers act

Bell v Boyes act

Dudin v Dudin & ors act

Norton v Hughes act

Winter v Purvis act

Hughes v Carnarvonshire Slate Co l d act

Earl of Ravensworth v Eden act

Allen v Trueman act

Roberts v Gough m f j

In re Carter, Guest v Hill act

Young v Solly act

Walton v Robinson act

Harwood v Calger act

In re George, George v George act

Richards v Howell act

Michell v Bunny act

Marriott v Bozzard act

Treadwell v London & S W Ry Co act

Gill v Gleadall act

Forman v Hobson act

Ingram v Webb act

Jackson v Harris act

Caygill v Paruca & ors act

Eyle v London Finance Association, l d

Causes for Trial without witnesses



## Adjourned Summonses.

Harrison v Cornwall Minerals Ry Co  
Same v Same  
In re Coxall Coxall v Coxall  
In re W Sumner Williams v Sumner  
In re Monk Wayman v Monk appl  
of Northampton Bkg Co  
In re French Love v Hills appl of  
Law Property, &c, Soc  
In re Baker Coppin v Humphrey  
appl of Pltff  
In re Carter Guest v Hills  
In re Walley Walley v Robinson  
In re Warren Weadon v Reading  
In re Martin Dier v Martin appl of  
Deft to vary certificate  
In re Radon Radon v Parnell appl  
of Christiana Maria Radon  
Lery v Met & Met District Ry Co appl  
of Priscilla Levy  
In re Strong Gray v Strong  
Jones v Williams  
Wife v Hughes

## Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).  
Price v Bala and Festing Ry Co act  
May 1  
In re Pritchard & Dodd's application &  
Messrs W Waller & Co's opposition &  
Trade Mark Acts adj smns with  
wits  
Digby v Evans act (transferred from  
Q B Division, by order)  
Dickinson v Dickinson act  
In re A M Blake, decd Faulconer v  
MacKenzie adj smns with wits, by  
order  
The London Agency, lmd, v The Mil-  
ford Haven Ry and Estate Co, lmd  
act May 1  
Craig v Trimin act  
Holland v Watney act  
Blitt v Clark act  
In re James Schofield, decd, Whitaker  
v Schofield Radcliffe v Schofield act &  
counter-claim  
The York City & County Bank v The  
Yorkshire Banking Co lmd act  
Bowlby v Taylor act  
In re Brown, decd Brown v Walmaley  
act  
Elsey v Bailey Elsey v Bailey cons acts  
Bull v Saunders act  
Pickering v Hopkinson & Sons act  
Arnold v Wickens act  
In re R. B. Barrett decd Barrett v  
Barrett act  
Nowell v Waller Smart v Nowell act  
and counter-claim  
Watson v The Belt Copper Mines lmd  
act  
Alston v Baker act  
Schmitt v Cohen act  
Coxons v Palmer act  
James v Hathnauce act  
Pennfather v Elmslie act  
Stemming v Fox act  
Baldwin v Baker act and In re Baker's  
Trade Mark adj smns  
Hine v Saunders Saunders v Hine  
Carter v Hine act and counter-  
claims  
Beauchamp v Campbell act  
Mitchell v Bennett Bennett v Mitchell  
act and counter-claim  
Bean v Wates act  
Dadson v Lancashire Maxim Weston  
Electric Light Co act May 1  
In re Johnson decd Johnson v Sly Sly  
v B'ake act  
Buckton v Bentley act  
Yore v Algar act  
Corpe v Philbrick Philbrick v Corpe  
act and counter-claim  
Rowley v London Fish Market and  
National Fishery Co act  
Marp's v The same Co act  
Pether v Halsey act  
Acher v Rope act  
In re Finlay decd Finlay v Clarke act  
Wyer v Tonkins act & m f j  
Dodd v Macfoy act  
Crowder v Charrington act  
Morony v Newmarket Colls & Co lmd act  
In re Colville-Brown, decd Brown v  
Brown act (S O till deposes filed)  
Maple v Harcourt act  
Burningham v Howlett act  
In re W Spencer's appn and T M Act  
adj smns with cross exam on affidvts  
Orr v Bowman act

Nightingall v Cannon act  
Dawson v Phoenix Electric Light & Co  
Co act  
Clark & ors v South Metrop Gas Co act  
Pope v Pope act  
Bethell v Ferrares Land Reclaim Co lmd  
act  
Edwards v Thompson act  
Chapman v Wade act  
Beddington v Deichmann act  
Blaxland v Blaxland act  
Ellis v Newsome act  
Hunt v Penley act  
Woodgate v Commissioners of Sewers  
for City of London act  
Royle v Beard act  
In re Sheard, decd Stocker v Sheard  
act  
Phipps v Oxford University act  
Fleet v Spalding act  
Harper v Genese act  
Newman v Newman act  
Baker v Aston Local Board act  
Jennings v Turney act  
In re Sir W. Hult, decd Bowes v Hult  
act

## Further Considerations.

Renshaw v Renshaw f c  
Renshaw v Rostoun act for trial by  
order  
In re Hodgson, decd Clough v Reddish  
f c  
In Thackeray, decd Holcombe v Packs  
f c  
In re Johnstone, decd Hammett v  
Kerry f c  
In re Cutlan, decd Cutlan v Cutlan f c  
Lloyd's Banking Co v Barbados Gas Co  
lmd f c  
In re Allwood, decd. Allwood v Balk  
f c  
Dicks v Jackson f c  
In re Watson, decd Watson v Watson  
f c and smns to vary.  
Haywood v Ostcliffe f c upon referee's  
report and motn to vary report  
In re Bywater, decd Bywater v Clarke  
f c  
In re Webb & ors, decd Hale v Webb  
f c  
Berridge v Pease f c  
Davis v Wells f c  
In re Paul, decd Evans v Evans f c

## Procedure Summonses.

In re John Orr-Ewing's Estate Ewing  
v Ewing dect's adj mtn to stay pro-  
ceedings  
In re The same action plit's adj smns  
dated 4th March, 1884 for directions  
under Scotch interlocute  
In re The same action plit's adj smns  
dated 30th Jan, 1883 to proceed with  
accounts & under decree (April 23,  
by order)

Non-witness Causes, Adjourned Sum-  
monses and Special Cases.  
Dauvillier v Myers (to review taxn)  
adj smns pt bd  
Paget v Clagett act  
Brown, Shipley & Co v Kough act  
Morley v The Central Permt Benefit  
Building Soc adj smns  
In re Adleshaw & Warburton adj smns  
In re J Wood, decd, Adams v Eldridge  
act  
In re Hambro's Settled Estates adj  
smns  
In re D Blyth, decd, Blyth v Thomson  
act  
Elkins v Capital Guarantee Society act  
In re W Heathcote, decd, Sturgeons v  
Arvilet act  
Kennedy v Hatley act  
Wills v Eyton m f j  
Penrice v Williams m f j upon award  
Manchester & Salford Bank lmd v Sow-  
croft act  
In re Perks decd Perks v Hiron act  
In re J Defries' Estate Nordon v  
Levy adj smns to review taxn  
In re Artistic Colour Printing Co  
Workman's case adj smns to review  
taxn  
In re John Appleton's Estate Barber v  
Tobbit adj smns  
Brake v Allen adj smns  
In re G H Carthew adj smns to review  
taxn

In re Devon & Cornwall Electric Light  
& Power Co lmd adj smns  
Chave v Bridgewater act & m f j  
Baker v Pringle plit's interpleader smns  
Plantagenet-Harrison v Watson m f j  
upon specially endorsed writ  
In re Lunn decd Sturgeons v Lunn act  
Harvey v Lambert originating smns  
set down by order of judge  
In re Morgan adjourned smns Sugg  
v Bray smns  
Shepherd v Jones act  
Davies v Morgan act  
In re The Westminster Hotel Co (Rhyll)  
lmd (expte Sheen) adj smns  
In re Kemp's Estate Poste v Kemp  
adj smns  
In re Hanson's Estate Hanson v Han-  
son adj smns  
Fray v Drew adj smns to vary  
certificate  
In re Hoar's estate Wansborough v  
Roscoe adj smns  
In re Batten decd Batten v Batten act  
Wise v Trenholm m f j on findings of  
chief clerk's certificate  
In re Talbot's Estate Talbot v Frere  
adj smns  
Fox v Brixham Harbour, & Commis-  
sioners act  
In re Richard Boorn's Trusts adj  
smns under Order 55  
Hodgson v Smith m f j  
Clement v Chessman act  
Bryde v Davies m f j  
Pawsey v Armstrong adj smns  
In re Symond's Trusts adj smns  
In re Eckington's Freehold Land Soc  
adj smns  
In re Cwm Avon & Co Sobrino's  
Claim adj smns  
In re Hoar decd Wansborough v Roscoe  
adj smns  
In re B. Bates & in re H. Bates decd  
Lawson v Holyland adj smns  
Troup to Campbell & V & P Act: adj  
smns  
In re Birch decd Roe v Birch adj  
smns  
In re Hodgson's Trusts adj smns  
Dicks v Blackwood act  
Allen v Frere act  
Doerks v Malkern act  
Dickson v Dickson Dickson v Parson  
act & m f j  
In re Harris decd Jason v Queen  
Anne's Bounty adj smns  
In re Brandon's adj smns  
Brooks v Jones adj enquiry  
Bick-steth v Govett act  
Moll v Lydall act  
In re Dunn, decd Richardson v Pal-  
lister act  
In re Dunhill, decd Boston v Wase  
m f j  
Hemsworth v Campbell adj smns  
Williams v Williams adj smns  
In re E. Segor's Will adj smns  
Butler v Cunningham act  
In re Bridge-Hall, decd Taylor v Hall act  
Heywood v Sutton act  
Price v Insole act  
In re Redman, decd Redman v Barter  
m f j  
Young v Robertson act  
Budget v Kingswood Coal & Iron Co  
lmd act and m f j  
Reed Bowen & Co v Cooper Hall & Co  
act  
Royle v Royle act  
In re R. Stagg's Estate Stagg v Birt  
adj smns  
In re Richards & Co lmd adj smns  
In re The Oorgun Gold &c. Co adj  
smns  
Wilson v Dodds adj smns  
Stevens v Met District Ry Co act  
In re Jules's Trade Mark adj smns  
Dymond v R. b'nson the younger act  
Gilbert v Guard act & m f j  
In re Levitt's Estate Farmilee v  
Levitt adj smns to take opinions  
In re Prince Bathany-Strattman's  
Estate Bathany-Strattman v  
Walford adj smns (April 28)  
Butler v Butler act  
Jackson v Falkner act  
Booleston v Williams act  
In re Chas Renny decd Sandwith v  
Cowie act  
Dunn v Walton act  
Cottrell v Holland m f j

In re Pagett to William's Contract &  
V & P Act adj smns  
In re The Seacdale Brewery Co Claim  
of Chesterfield Bkg Co adj smns  
In re John Poole's Estate & Settled  
Lund Act adj smns  
In re Webb to Streatham Hill & Co &  
V & P Act adj smns  
In re T P Pitt's Settlement Collins v  
Pitts adj smns  
In re Indian Co-operative Agency lmd  
(Drew's Case) adj smns  
In re Northern's Estate Salt v Pym  
adj smns  
Walton v Dunn act & m f j  
Sturdy v Cresser act  
In re Charles Evans decd Beynon v  
Beynon Evans v Beynon m f j

## Before Mr. Justice NORTH.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).  
Bonham v Irvine act  
Plumtree v Blaxland act  
Raimondi v Great Western Ry Co act  
Sugg & Co lmd v Bray & Co act  
Gething v Lewis Merthyr & Co  
lmd act  
Cooper v Bullen act wits  
Lewis Merthyr Co. v Gething act  
The Callie-Bis Gold Mining Co lmd v  
Downes act wits  
Smith v Harris act  
In re Stokes, Stokes v Read act  
  
Transferred from Mr. Justice Kay and  
Mr. Justice Pearson pursuant to order  
dated Nov 15, 1883.  
In re S D Hearle, W of Engl & Bk  
v Cock act  
In re Matthews Hider v Powell act  
Fleming v Cronach act  
Stobbs v Kelsey act  
In re Davies Jones v Jones act  
Dix v Coventry act pt hd  
Payton v Saunders act  
In re Gilbert Webster v Gilbert act  
Gillig v Gillig act  
Mackroth v Oddy act  
Pardev v Smith act  
Briggs v Briggs act  
Kemble v Bedwell act & m f j  
James v Young act  
Casper v Goggs act  
Johnson v Pate act  
In re Fortnum In re Lovell Haat v  
Fortnum act  
Crauford v Royal Exchange Assurance  
Corporation act  
Lewin v Jones act  
Litchfield v Gater act  
Craddock v Rogers act  
Lovejoy v Cooke act  
Proleau v Kewlock f c  
Clarke v Foxley act  
In re Mortimer In re Wilson Wilton  
v Mortimer act  
Williams v Simeet act  
Blackat v Blackett act  
In re Welbourn Hunter v Burton act  
Bellis v Johnson act  
Beaumont v Beaumont act  
Brower v Jones act  
In re Attfield In re Rowe Peck v Att-  
field act  
Field v Ford act  
Heinrichs v Westinghouse act  
Jobbins v Standing act  
Mayor, &c, of New Windsor v Stovall  
act  
In re Griffiths Pearson v Griffiths act  
Hooper v Sewell act  
In re Joseph In re Penny Murray v  
Joseph act  
In re J J Roebuck Scholes v Whitley  
act  
Charlsworth v Skyes act  
Cowgill v Rawson act  
Mendham v Thomas act  
Perkins v Angel act  
  
Transferred from Mr Justice Chitty and  
Mr Justice Pearson pursuant to order,  
dated 12th April, 1884  
Maull v Loele act  
Mo v Bradburn act  
Sharpe v Andrews act  
Crosse v Randall act  
Barker v Allen act  
Ewen v Sharp act  
McDougall v Knight act  
Beck v Pollitzer act  
Frere v Winalow act

Bryant v Barrett act  
 Lavery v Martin act  
 Fothergill v Lavery act  
 Scott v Graham act  
 Lancaster v Gould act  
 Nottingham Joint Stock Bank, Ltd v Williams act  
 In re Gibson, Nutt v Gibson act  
 Bray v D'Aublene act  
 Heppenstall v Hose act  
 Blakey v Chimax Boat, & Co, Ltd act  
 Marshall v Singer act  
 Sindeman v Musgrave act  
 Burr v Sittingbourne, & Co, Ltd act  
 Karl Poulett v Same Co act  
 Goodhart v Enever act  
 Freeman v Danton, Danton v Freeman  
 Beal v Beal act  
 Bunge v Winton act  
 Haggard v Haggard act  
 Lee v Dunsford act  
 Shilross v Churchill act  
 Tuck & ors v Reynolds & Co act  
 Banner v Bates act  
 Bishop v Wade act  
 Symonds v Hallett act  
 Mourant v Le Cromier act  
 Montgomerie v Salmon act  
 Harvey v Wilkin act  
 Drover v Capital and Counties Bank, Ltd act  
 Simons v John act  
 John v Simons  
 Brooke v Stephen act  
 Seration v City Bank Ltd act  
 Bowes v Joines act  
 De Gallatin v Duffield act  
 Fielden v Pixley act  
 Wilkinson v Easton act  
 Hooker v Gas Meter Co act  
 Davenport v Orme act  
 Bottrill v Dell act  
 Kington v West act  
 Hill v Clark act  
 Dudley v Ward act  
 Ward v Dudley act  
 Jackson v Blam act  
 Fox & Co v Firth act  
 Coxhead v Ellison act  
 Cottrill v Dyson act  
 In re Whitham Whitham v Whitham act  
 Woods v Woods act  
 Naylor v De Bernardy act  
 Hutchings v Humphreys act  
 Wales v Wheatley act  
 Clarke v Glover act  
 Nash v Wooderson act  
 Rosher v Cullen act  
 Rosher v Cullen act  
 Cullen v Rosher act  
 Chestle v Billinghurst act  
 Smith v Wills act  
 Studd v Watson act  
 Lamb v Belmont act  
 Carlisle City and District Banking Co. v Thompson act  
 Bather v. Potteries, Shrewsbury, & Co. v act  
 Clarke v Pannell act  
 Crook v Clarke act  
 Miller v Tanner act  
 Paine v Phelps act  
 Ford v Oram act  
 Oram v Ford act  
 Leader v Ward act  
 Aldrid v Upton act  
 London and River Plate Bank v Watters  
 Fitchew v Barwick act  
 Parks v Bateman act  
 Brewer v Brown act

Before Mr. Justice PHARSON.  
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses).  
 In re The Phosphate Manure Co. Ltd,  
 Ex parte Hartmont act  
 Young v Winter act (not before June 1)  
 Tudor v Tudor act  
 Holland v Sawbridge act  
 In re Monkman Lyne v Monkman act  
 Wheeler v Sharland act  
 Wilcox v Same act  
 In re Pearson, Oxley v South act  
 In re Owen, Lloyd v Owen act m f j  
 Dawson v Lawson act  
 In re Hooks Hooks v Parry act  
 In re Mappin Mappin v Viorace adj  
 summa  
 Clark v Saunders act  
 In re Prior, Prior v Prior act  
 In re Newton Hughes v Newton  
 adj summa

Salisbury v Wickham act  
 Standing v Bowring act  
 Ecclesiastical Commrs v Pearson act  
 Selway v Hales Hales v Selway act  
 Singleton v Cracknell act  
 Mitchell v Ford act  
 Stephenson v Stephenson act  
 Exchange & Warehouse Ltd v Land  
 Financiers Ltd act (not before July 1)  
 Noyes v Pollock act and m f j  
 Lowenfeld v Hoynes act  
 In re Edwards Fisher v Edwards act  
 Deacon v Luff act  
 In re Blackley Wickham v Digby  
 Digby v Wickham act and m f j  
 Bartholomew v Tippet act  
 Barrill v Padwick act  
 Atherley v Barnett act  
 Foodick v Hurter act  
 Bellamy v Rowbotham act  
 Weston v Stringer act  
 Rice v Broadley act and m f j  
 Drury v B-nnett act and m f j  
 Gaskell v Phillips & Co act  
 Lloyd's Banking Co Ltd v Jones act  
 Leigh v Burnett act  
 Bailey v House Property Trust Ltd act  
 Jones v North and South Wales Bank  
 Ltd act  
 Cardinall v Cardinall act  
 Wood v Lambert act  
 Croydon v Prudential, & Co motn  
 Off v House Property Trust, Ltd act  
 Pilling & Co v Mayor, & Co of Hudders-  
 field act  
 Dunn v Graddon act  
 Walker & Sons v Carr & Sons act  
 Ferguson v Collier act  
 Class v Marshall act  
 Green v Ibbetson act  
 Hodge v Gillbanks act  
 Fitzgerald v Digby act  
 Reed v Same act  
 Waterhouse v Macgregor pt act  
 Purland v Balls act  
 Peck v Boyd act  
 Chapman v Fielder act  
 In re Chapman Hunter v Chapman act  
 Durant v Phillips act  
 Johnston v English act  
 Ashdown v Davis act  
 Brown v Gourand act  
 In re Owen Breese v Owen act  
 Stevens v Coles act  
 Potter v Potter act  
 Francis Canal Steam Towing Co v  
 Powis act

#### Causes for Trial (without witnesses).

Arnold v Allen act  
 In re Morgan Rees v Morgan m f j  
 In re Bennett Bennett v Price s o  
 Morris v Neil act  
 Bradford v Young act  
 In re Rosher Rosher v Rosher s o  
 Hyde v Hyde s o  
 Gow v Foster s o  
 In re Ormston Aldam v Ford m f j  
 Hunter v Caldecott m f j  
 In re Graver-Browne Hare v Hare s o  
 In re W Paddock Miller v Toll s o  
 In re Powell, the elder Owen v Powell  
 act  
 Cole v Crush act  
 In re Laurence Laurence v Laurence  
 s o  
 McWilliam v Rooms s o & m f j  
 Longden v Longden m f j  
 Carter v Hook act  
 In re Evans Phillips v Evans act  
 Cross v Coltart s o and m f j  
 Sadler v Bryant act  
 In re McLeod Harris v McLeod, m f j  
 In re Watts Cornford v Elliott s o  
 Waddington v Waddington m f j  
 Mutual Life Assurance Society v Lang-  
 ley act & m f j  
 Laurence v Nottingham Tramway Co,  
 Ltd for trial of act & sums  
 In re Ridings Ridings v Barnes act  
 In re J Hollis Hollis v Fletcher s p o  
 & m f j  
 In re Shield Pethybridge v Burrow act  
 In re Brooks Masgrave v Brooks act  
 Bates v Bates s p o  
 Coleman v Llewellyn act  
 In re Baynton Baynton v Whereat act  
 Gross v Dymant s o  
 Carnochan v Ireland act  
 Jelly Dudley v Keightley s o  
 In re Tuthill Fox v Lucas act & m f j

Lord Muncester v Skegness Pier Co  
 m f j  
 In re Hall Hall v Hall m f j  
 Matkin v Gould m f j  
 In re Parsons Usher v Smith m f j  
 Simons v John m f j  
 Walker v Maughan act  
 Meakin v Cox s o  
 In re Pottingill Wood v Skipper act  
 Leigh v Steele act  
 Gallard v Hawkins s o  
 In re Laverick Barlow v Laverick act  
 In re Cousens Cousens v Cousens  
 m f j & adj summa  
 In re Turabull Turabull v Turabull  
 s o  
 In re Evans, Evans v Dalros act  
 Wright v Little act  
 In re Kirk Nicholson v Kirk act &  
 m f j  
 Clennell v Clennell m f j  
 In re Davis Chapman v Davis act  
 Mayor of Bristol v Cox act  
 Sneyd v Sneyd act  
 Berridge v Hamby act  
 Barnaby v Equitable & Co. Society act  
 Miles v Gard act and m f j  
 Reid v Reid act  
 Tyson v Finlinton act  
 Montgomerie v Storer Bros & Coles act  
 Waddell v Fane act  
 In re Thompson, Cope v Thompson  
 m f j  
 Barker v Irvine act  
 Warburton v Crawshaw act  
 Clarke v Lloyd m f j  
 Johnstone v Earl Spencer act  
 Patey v Johnson m f j  
 Mason v Nash m f j  
 Sutherland v Lovering act & m f j  
 Manners v Mew act & m f j  
 Houston v Marquis of Sligo point of  
 law for argument  
 Shoosmith v Waits act  
 Bayly v White act  
 Bines v Johnson act  
 Beale v Duncan m f j (short)  
 Wilson v Barnes act  
 Newton v Newton act  
 Baynes v Morton Bros & Co act  
 Dicketta v England act  
 Kelsey v Belton act (short)  
 Courage v Baker act  
 Colley v Baker act  
 Black and anr v Companhia Portuges a  
 Navigao and ors act  
 Hon A. Rington, M.F., v Ellesmere  
 m f j  
 Smith v Attorney-General act

#### Further Considerations.

Guest v Newnes f o & sums  
 Lodge v Forrest f o  
 In re Hill & Swarbrick, Lodge v For-  
 rest f o  
 In re Potter, Potter v Potter f o  
 In re Smith, Harrison v Pryor f o  
 Johnson v Gale f o  
 In re Sheppard, Sheppard v Blancome  
 f o  
 In re Horley, Drnitt v Mayo f o  
 In re Whitham, Potter v Whitham f o  
 In re Blackford, Blackford v Worsley  
 f o  
 Hatfield v Buckingham f o  
 Same v Same f o  
 In re Young, Chapman v Readwin f o  
 Sandison v Gidroy f o  
 Hollingshead v Pugh  
 In re Smith, Smith v Tyndall f o  
 In re Green, Jewett v Green f o

#### Adjourned Summonses

In re Whitham Whitham v Whitham  
 In re Same Same v Same  
 In re Wilcock Thompson v Barstow  
 Whitaker v Shutt  
 In re Roberts & Po lard, &  
 In re Hearsey Hearsey v Poek-  
 In re Shepherd Jones v Shepherd  
 In re Crowder's Trust  
 In re Raw Morris v Griffith

In re Old Falstaff Club, Ltd  
 In re Smith Harrington v True  
 Gardner v Jay  
 In re Avonside Engine Co, Ltd & Co's  
 Acta  
 In re Olive Olive v Olive  
 Page v Page  
 In re Quin Sed v Quin  
 In re Marples Marples v Marples  
 In re Toller Toller v Northcote  
 In re H Chalk, Webb & Co, Ltd In re  
 Same (expte H Chalk Webb) In re  
 Same (expte Contributors) In re  
 Same (expte Wilesmith) leave to give  
 notice for parties to attend to be cross  
 examined  
 In re Harrison Harrison v Harrison  
 Van-Tromp v Smith  
 In re Pollock Pollock v Warrell  
 In re Ferrier Ferrier v Ferrier  
 In re Arney Speed v Collis  
 In re Woolger Birdsey v Honson  
 In re Jayne Jayne v Jayne  
 In re Ladywell Mining Co, Ltd and Co's  
 Acta  
 In re the same Co  
 Church v Church  
 Fallwood v Fallwood  
 Hunt v Hudson  
 In re Taylor Halsey v Randall and f o  
 (by order)  
 In re Pearce May v Eliacott  
 Smith v Maclure  
 Todd v Fryer (for judgment on admissions)  
 In re Norris Allen v Norris  
 In re Chapel House Colliery Co, Ltd  
 In re Dance Brown v Crow  
 In re Brocas Cro v Marriage  
 In re Roe Roe v Roe  
 Pileon Joel, & Co, v Osborne  
 In re Smith Smith v Smith  
 Flawitt v Walker  
 In re The Carriage Co-operative Supply  
 Association Ltd  
 In re Hall Hall v Hall  
 In re Dunning Hatherly v Dunning  
 Boswell v Coaks  
 Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast, & Co,  
 v Wright & Butler Ltd  
 In re Atkinson Baskley v Daniel  
 In re I James and Settled Land Act  
 In re Norris Allen v Norris  
 In re Army and Navy Provision Market  
 Ltd and Co's Acta  
 Mayor, & Co, of Bristol v Cox  
 Greville v Marquis of Salisbury  
 In re Evans Hughes v Leigh  
 Hartley v Smith  
 In re Stewart Stewart v Crooks  
 In re Same Same v Same  
 In re Compton Nortos v Compton  
 Chadwick v Rhoad  
 Llanover v Homfray  
 Same v Same  
 In re Steele Leigh v Steele  
 In re Brand Cullidower v Holloway  
 In re Wilkinson Milward v Wilkinson  
 In re Hill Hill v Lane  
 Harlow v Noah  
 Noyes v Pollock  
 Cault v Langdon (expte Pltff)  
 Same v Same (expte Pltff)  
 Boswell v Coaks (expte Pltff)  
 Same v Same (expte Delt O. J. Banyon)  
 In re Maidland Cochrane v Howden  
 In re Henry Paul  
 In re Poole's Settlement and Settled  
 Land Act  
 In re Tweedie and Miles's Contract and  
 V & P Act, 1874  
 In re Bateman Bateman v Mason  
 Barnett and Fox v Barnett's Screw  
 Stopper, & Co (expte Pltff)  
 Same v Same (expte Delt)  
 Ball v Maltz Ry Co Ltd (expte Pltff)  
 In re Stokes Cotton v Stokes (for acct)  
 Same v Same (for discovery & )  
 Bolton v Bolton  
 In re Whitham Whitham v Whitham  
 Penley v Rogers  
 Greville Nugent v Lord Salisbury

#### SUMMARY.

1.—V.C. BACON—Actions with and without Witnesses..	121
Adjourned Summonses..	31
	155
2.—Mr. Justice KAY—Witness Actions ..	91
Non-Witness Actions ..	11
Adjourned Summonses ..	16
Further Considerations ..	16
	134



3.—Mr. Justice CHITTY—Witness Actions .. .. .	71
Non-Witness Actions including Summonses .. .. .	100
Further Considerations and Procedure Sums .. .. .	15
4.—Mr. Justice NORTH—Witness Actions .. .. .	187
5.—Mr. Justice PEARSON—Witness Actions .. .. .	184
Non-Witness Actions .. .. .	67
Adjourned Summonses .. .. .	88
Further Considerations .. .. .	86
	17
	— 267
Total Causes and matters for Hearing in the Chancery Division ..	867

## QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1884.

New Trial Paper.

For Argument.]

Moved 20th December, 1879 Middlesex, Nowell v Williams Sir H Giffard Lord Coleridge (Pt hd 25th, 26th, and 28th May, 1880, before Lord Coleridge and Justices Grove and Lopes)

Moved 2nd March, 1881 Liverpool, Starr & anr v Bolland Mr Gully Justice Field (Stands over)

Moved 15th February, 1883 Norwich, Allison v Daplyn & ors Mr Cock Justice Mathew (Part heard To be mentioned)

Moved 18th June, 1883 Middlesex, Addison v Pether & Son Mr Kingsford Justice Mathew (Stands over till decision in Court of Appeal)

Set down 22nd December, 1883 Middlesex, Westinghouse the younger v Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co Mr Webster Justice Denman (Stands over Notice to be given)

Set down 1st January, 1884 Middlesex, Same v Same Solicitor-General Justice Denman (Stands over Notice to be given)

Set down 19th February, 1884 Leeds, Marley v Jackson & ors, Bedford and ors v Jackson & ors Mr Forbes Justice Field (Stands for debts to apply)

Set down 22nd February, 1884 Leeds, Marley v Jackson & ors, Bedford & ors v Jackson and ors Mr Rigby Justice Field (Stands for debts to apply)

Set down 18th March, 1884 Middlesex, Wagstaff & anr v Jacobowitz Mr Murphy Baron Huddleston

Set down 20th March, 1884 Middlesex, Page v Harrison Mr C Russell Justice Hawkins

Set down 28th March, 1884 Middlesex, Weldon v Lloyd Pitt in Person Baron Huddleston

Set down 28th March 1884 Middlesex, Gauntlett v Grosvenor Bank sued &c. Mr Collins Justice Lopes

Set down 28th March 1884 Middlesex, Halses v Guthrie Mr MacIntyre Justice Grove

Set down 29th March 1884 Middlesex, Dover v Syrett Mr Finlay Justice Stephen

Set down 1st April 1884 Middlesex, Merson v London & North-Western Ry Co Mr Bremner Baron Huddleston

Set down 4th April 1884 Middlesex, Owen v Grant & Co. Mr Pollard Justice Mathew

Set down 7th April 1884 Middlesex, Harrison McGregor & Co v Taylor and anr Mr C Russell Justice Hawkins

Set down 8th April 1884 Middlesex, Rose Smythe & Co v Bannington Justice Lopes

Set down 9th April 1884 Middlesex, Bambridge v Randall Mr MacIntyre Justice Stephen

Set down 9th April 1884 Middlesex, Lightfoot v Crothwaite Mr R T Reid Baron Huddleston

Set down 9th April 1884 Middlesex, Barrow & anr v Dyster, Nalder & Co Mr R T Reid Justice Lopes

Set down 10th April 1884 Middlesex, Sootney exor &c v Chamberlayne & anr Mr Pollard Baron Huddleston

Set down 10th April 1884 Middlesex, Huddleston v Wooller & anr Mr J J Sims Baron Huddleston

Set down 16th April 1884 Middlesex, Smith v Dart & Son Justice Hawkins

Set down 16th April 1884 Middlesex, Connery v Best, Saxby & Co Mr Jelf Justice Hawkins

Set down 16th April 1884 Middlesex, Australian Co ld v Mr MacAndrew Mr Cohen Justice Grove

Set down 17th April 1884 Middlesex, Todd v Flower Mr Keogh Justice Stephen

Set down 17th April 1884 Middlesex, Sanroma v Evans & Son Mr Petheram Justice Hawkins

Special Paper.

For Argument.

Restored 1st June 1883 Blawitt & anr (Noon and Co) v Cotton demr to defence (Stands over, notice to be given)

Set down 4th June 1883 Lodge (Parkers) v Crossley demr to defence (Stands over till decision on appeal in Bankruptcy)

Set down 22nd February 1884 Hamilton, Fraser & Co (Williamson, Hill & Co) v Staley, Radford & Co special case

Set down 2nd April 1884 Shaw (Jaques & Co) v Port Phillip and Colonial Gold Mining Co, liand special case before two judges

Opposed Motions.

For Judgment.

Howcroft v Reeves (heard before Baron Pollock and Justice Lopes, Jan 28, 1884) Lins and ors v Warren, the elder (heard before Lord Chief Justice of England and Baron Pollock, Feb 27, 1884)

Alderton v Archer (heard before Lord Chief Justice of England and Baron Pollock, Feb 27, 1884)

Standing over.

Beckett v West Worthing Hotel Co

Leach and ors v Dowdell

Same v Same (pt hd to be resumed before Justices Day and A L Smith)

Bank of New Zealand v Harris and anr (stands till after issue tried)

Walker v Link (S O generally)

Hamber v Buckout (S O till action tried)

Wood v Green and anr (S O till judgment given by Court of Appeal)

Van Nierop & Sons v Henderson Bros

Same v Same (stands for further report of Official Referee)

For Argument.

Thney v Staines & West Drayton Ry Co

Dearle v Fulton & anr

Manchester & Oldham Bank ld v Cook & Co

Jacobs, Hart & Co v Brown & anr (Godsell 3rd party)

Parker v First Avenue Hotel Cold

Cross v King

Bridgman v Pike

Davies v Fitzjames

In re Hepple & ors

Bavarian Brewery Co v Blundell

Provident Association of England ld v Thompson

Hamilton Fraser & Co v S'a'ey, Radford & Co

Marshall, trading, &c v Rocella & anr

Ran v Peruvian Guano Co

Casson v Churcholey (E Churcholey claimant)

London & Provincial Stock Exchange Co ld v Willis

Shaw & Co v Henderson (P A Boulton claimant)

Chancery Division Hughes & anr v Morgan

Ga'h v Howarth

Chapman v Holmes

In re a Solicitor (Expte Incorporated Law Society)

In re an Arbitr between Oelrichs & Co and Van Giehn & Sons

Salm-Kyrburg v Posnanski

Causton & Sons v Lewis

Provident Association of England ld v Thompson

Bates v Burchell (Carter 3rd party)

Fane v Donoughmore

Hartas v Williamson

Dorton v Gal on

Jones v Evans

Taylor v Williams

Farber v Black

Crown Paper.

For Judgment.

Middlesex The Queen v H. M. Postmaster-General Nisi for mandamus to appoint arbitrator Ex parte G W Railway Co Argued 28th March

Anglesey Mersey Docks & Bd v Overseers of Llanollan Quarter Sessions Special Case 12 & 13 Vist o 45 s 11 Argued 10th March

Essex The Queen v Commissioners of Sewers for Fobbing &c Mandamus Special case Argued 14th March

For Argument.

Kent The Queen v South-Eastern Ry Co Nisi for mandamus to assess compensation Ex parte Simpson and anr

Surrey The Queen v Overseers of St Mary Magdalen Barncombe Nisi for mandamus to make out provisional list Ex parte Barrow

Lancashire, Bury Sead v Dixon County Court Motion to enter judgment for plaintiff or for new trial

Derbyshire The Queen v Woodforde Reg. Judge of County Court of Derbyshire, holden at Belper and Fisher Nisi to hear &c. action "Fisher v Heathcote;" or for certiorari to remove proceedings

Manchester Seldon v Charlton & Sons Magistrate's case

Essex The Queen v Powell Esq and ors Jj &c Nisi for conviction Ex parte Gay

London Direct Spanish Tel Co v Shepherd City of London Court Motion to enter judgment for pils

Kent The Queen v Waring esq and ors Jj &c and Borer and ors Nisi to Jj to make orders under Public Health Act 1875 Ex parte Bromley Local Board

Met Pol Dist Williams v Board of Works Wandsworth District Magistrate's case

Yorkshire Bradford Yeld and Co v Walker County Court Special case Dlt's appeal W T S Daniel esq Judge

Sussex The Queen v Tookes esq and anr Jj &c Nisi for certiorari for order of dismissal and certificate of same Ex parte Heayman

Sussex The Queen v Tookes esq and others &c and Trascott Nisi to hear information Ex parte Heayman

Cheshire The Queen v Overseers of Township of Macclesfield Nisi for mandamus to convene Vestry and take poll Ex parte Carr

Essex The Queen v Judge of County Court of Essex holden at Southend and Poynter Nisi to hear action Ex parte Perfort and anr

Middlesex, Westminster Sherstone and ors Wray County Court Special case Dlt's appeal F Bayley esq Judge

Essex Modern Permit Bldg Soc v Hood and anr County Court Motion to enter judgment for dfts or new trial

Birmingham The Queen v Elkington esq and anr Jj &c Nisi for certiorari for order Ex parte Stanbury

Lancashire The Queen v Judge of Salford Hundred Court and Worsley Bros Nisi for prohibition Ex parte Reynolds

Liverpool The Queen v Haslehurst auditor &c Application for certiorari to disallowances Ex parte Jones Referred by Justice Mathew from Chambers 2nd Feb 1884

Middlesex Westminster Peckham v London General Omnibus Co County Court Pils motion for new trial

Met Pol Dist Vestry of Marylebone v Rose Magistrate's case

Surrey, Southark Hough v Augur County Court Motion to enter judgment for dft or new trial

Yorkshire, Kingston upon Hall Leggoit v Empringham and ors County Court Motion to enter judgment for pils

Essex, Chelmsford Grimes v Grimes County Court Motion for new trial

Glamorganshire The Queen v Guardians of Stepney Poor Law Union Order of Sessions Nisi to quash

Revenue Paper.

For Argument.

Attorney-Gen of the Duchy of Lancaster v The Duke of Devonshire Exceptions to answer

The Broughton & Plas Coal Co ld v W. J. Kirkpatrick (Surveyor of Taxes)

## COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.  
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

**CANNOCK BREWERY COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Chitty, J., dated April 8, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Cave and Cave, Walbrook, solicitors for the petitioner.

**CITY OF LONDON PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 12, directed to be heard before Pearson, J., on April 26. Mills, Old Serjeants' inn, Chancery lane, agent for King, Portsea, solicitor for the petitioner.

**GREAT HOLWAY LEAD COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented April 17, directed to be heard before Bacon, V.C., on April 26. Hamlin and Co, Staple inn, agents for Cartwright, Chester, solicitor for the petitioner.

**OLATHE SILVER MINING COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented April 16, directed to be heard before Pearson, J., on April 26. Miller and Miller, Sherborne lane, Cannon st, solicitors for the petitioner.

**BORAX COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Pearson, J., dated April 8, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Munk & Co, Queen Victoria st, solicitors for the petitioners.

**CENTRAL METROPOLITAN RAILWAY COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented April 21, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on May 2. Fisher and Co, Old Jewry chambers, solicitors for the petitioner.

**GRESHAM BANK, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented April 21, directed to be heard before Pearson, J., on May 3. Fisher and Carter, Old Jewry chambers, solicitors for the petitioner.

**J. B. ROGERS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented April 17, directed to be heard before Bacon, V.C., on May 2. Rooks and Co, King st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioners.

**ULVERSTON MINING COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Stephen Hart Jackson, Ulverston. May 23 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

**UNITED KINGDOM BOAT AND FISHERMEN'S ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Chitty, J., dated March 22, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Munk and Co, Queen Victoria st, solicitors for the petitioner.

[Gazette, April 18.]

[Gazette, April 22.]

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

**BROGDEN LODGE, No. 917, N.A.I.U.O.O.F.,** George Inn, Station st, Darlaston, Stafford. April 16th.

**NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE WORKING MAN'S PERMANENT BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY.** April 16.

**PEMBROKE PROVIDENT BENEFIT SOCIETY,** National School, Pembroke. April 17.

[Gazette, April 22.]

## SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

April 22.—Messrs. **ELLIS & SON**, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, page 4).

April 30.—Messrs. **EDWIN FOX & BOUFFIELD**, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Leasehold Ground Rent (see advertisement, March 22, page 3).

## DEATH.

**DUNN.**—Mar. 30, at Harrogate, Dorothy Ann Dunn, the wife of Hugh Dunn, solicitor, town clerk of Darlington, aged 61.

The prospectus is issued of the Enderley Mills (Limited) having a capital of £150,000 in 30,000 shares of £5 each, of which the present issue consists of 20,000 shares. The company is formed for the purpose of taking over, continuing, and extending the business of the army contractor, general uniform manufacturer, and equipment furnisher, established and successfully carried on by Mr. Richard Stanway at the Enderley Mills, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire, and for acquiring the freehold mills, with their machinery and plant, as a going concern.

The directors of the National Life Assurance Society have issued their report, in which they state that during 1883 the new assurances effected were somewhat less than those in the previous year; but they have reason to believe that the recent alterations in the rules and practice of the society have been very cordially approved, especially that by which, while the fullest security was provided, the unlimited liability of individual members was abolished; and that by which claims are now payable in thirty days, instead of three months, after admission of the proof of death.

At the Stock and Share Auction and Advance Company's sale, held on the 24th inst., at their rooms, 58, Lombard-street, City, the following were among the prices obtained:—Denver Gold, 2s. 3d.; Ruby and Dunderberg Consolidated Old Shares, 20s.; New shares, 20s.; Army and Navy Hotel, 37s. 6d.; Kapanga Gold, 4s. 6d.; Hoover Hill Gold, 4s.; Nouveau Monde, 3s. 6d. Other miscellaneous shares fetched fair prices.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

FRIDAY, April 18, 1884.

**Banks, Robert,** Manchester, Photographer. Manchester. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam April 22 at 12.30.

**Davy, Joseph,** Kingston on Hull, Licensed Victualler. Kingston on Hull. Pet April 14. Ord April 16. Exam April 22 at 12 at the Court house, Townhall, Hull.

**Green, Morris,** Sheffield, Table Blade Grinder. Sheffield. Pet April 15. Ord April 16. Exam May 8 at 11.30.

**Hare, Francis,** Sheffield, Fish Salesman. Sheffield. Pet April 15. Ord April 16. Exam May 8 at 11.30.

**Harley, W. Salford,** Lancashire, Oil Manufacturer. Salford. Pet Mar 31. Ord April 16. Exam April 30 at 2.

**Howorth, John,** Heywood, Lancashire, Commission Agent. Bolton. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam May 14.

**Johnson, Robert,** Sunderland, Confectioner. Sunderland. Pet April 10. Ord April 10. Exam April 24 at 2.30.

**Jones, Edward,** Torquay, Gent. Exeter. Pet April 2. Ord April 16. Exam May 1 at 11.

**Jukes, John Webb,** Newport (Mon.), Tobaccoist. Newport (Mon.). Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam April 22 at 11.

**Kitching, Samuel William,** Sheffield, Grocer, Sheffield. Pet April 10. Ord April 16. Exam May 8 at 11.30.

**Lee, John Widger,** Topsham, Devonshire, Hotel Keeper. Exeter. Pet April 2. Ord April 16. Exam April 25 at 11.

**McEwan, Oliver,** High Holborn, Teacher of Shorthand. High Court. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam May 22 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.

**Nathan, Joseph,** Birmingham, Boot Maker. Birmingham. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam May 8.

**O'Hanlon, Michael,** Stanley, Lancashire, Shipping Clerk. Liverpool. Pet April 9. Ord April 16. Exam April 22 at 11.

**Parry, Robert,** Hurstpierpoint, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Brighton. Pet April 15. Ord April 16. Exam May 8 at 12.

**Poxon, George,** Gt Yarmouth, Bricklayer. Gt Yarmouth. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam May 10 at 10.30 at Townhall, Gt Yarmouth.

**Smyth, Zachariah,** Barnstaple, Carriage Builder. Barnstaple. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam April 25.

**Wilson, Edward,** Darlaston, Staffordshire, Draper. Walsall. Pet April 10. Ord April 16. Exam May 5.

**Wyatt, James,** Westbromwich, Staffordshire, Greengrocer. Oldbury. Pet April 7. Ord April 10. Exam April 25.

## FIRST MEETINGS.

**Bear, William,** Padham, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. April 22 at 2.30. Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley.

**Blackburn, Samuel William,** Leeds, Grocer. April 30 at 11. Official Receiver, St. Andrew's chmrs, 22, Park row, Leeds.

**Butterfield, Charles,** Ironmonger lane, Solicitor. April 30 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

**Churchley, Job,** West Bromwich, Staffordshire, Draper. April 29 at 3. Luke Jesson Sharp, Official Receiver, Whitehall chmrs, Colmore row, Birmingham.

**Francouer, Thomas Louis,** Ball's Pond rd, St Luke's, Fancy Bracket Maker. April 25 at 12. Bankruptcy Office, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.

**Hards, Alfred,** John, Sandwich, Licensed Victualler. April 25 at 2. 32, St. George's st, Canterbury.

**Howorth, John,** Heywood, Lancashire, Commission Agent. April 30 at 11. 18, Wood st, Bolton.

**Johnson, Robert,** Sunderland, Confectioner. April 25 at 12. Official Receiver, 21, Fawcett st, Sunderland.

**Johnston, William,** Carlisle, Cattle Dealer. April 29 at 3. 34, Fisher st, Carlisle.

**Jukes, John Webb,** Newport, Monmouthshire, Tobaccoist. April 30 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 24, Bridge st, Newport, Mon.

**George's Hall,** Lostwithiel, Cornwall, Coal Merchant. April 26 at 12. Duke of Cornwall Hotel, Plymouth.

**Nathan, Joseph,** Birmingham, Boot Manufacturer. April 29 at 11. Luke Jesson Sharp, Whitehall chmrs, Colmore row, Birmingham.

**O'Hanlon, Michael,** Stanley, Lancashire, Shipping Clerk. April 29 at 2. Official Receiver, Lisbon bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool.

**Parry, Robert,** Hurstpierpoint, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. April 30 at 2.30. 169, North st, Brighton.

**Ridgough, Robert,** Manchester, Baker. April 25 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Ogden's chmrs, Bridge st, Manchester.

**Rose, Thomas Edward,** King's Lynn, Boot Manufacturer. April 25 at 11. Mr. W. B. Whall, Market sq, King's Lynn.

**Shacklady, William Bailey,** Waltham Abbey, Essex, Corn Merchant's Manager. April 25 at 11. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane.

**Winslow, William Henry,** Westbury, Wiltshire, Hay Dealer. April 25 at 2.45. Lopes Arms Hotel, Westbury.

**Wyatt, James,** West Bromwich, Staffordshire, Greengrocer. April 25 at 11. Court-house, Oldbury.

## ADJUDICATIONS.

**Banks, Robert,** Manchester, Photographer. Manchester. Pet April 16. Ord April 16.

**Barrett, Francis,** Gateshead, Builder. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet April 2. Ord April 16.

**Beedham, Braylesford Harry,** Kimbolton, Huntingdonshire, Solicitor. High Court. Pet Feb 18. Ord April 16.

**Blackburn, Samuel William,** Leeds, Grocer. Leeds. Pet April 10. Ord April 16.

**Burton, Stephen,** Loughborough, Leicestershire, Seedsman. Leicester. Pet Mar 24. Ord April 10.

**Churchley, Job,** West Bromwich, Staffordshire, Draper. Oldbury. Pet April 5. Ord April 16.

**Gamble, John Tom,** Loughborough, Leicestershire, Innkeeper. Leicester. Pet Mar 25. Ord April 10.

**Green, Morris,** Sheffield, Table Blade Grinder. Sheffield. Pet April 15. Ord April 16.

**Hare, Francis,** Sheffield, Fish Salesman. Sheffield. Pet April 15. Ord April 16.

**Langley, John,** Stockport, Cheshire, Felt Hat Body Maker. Stockport. Pet April 1. Ord April 16.

**McEwan, Oliver,** High Holborn, Teacher of Shorthand. High Court. Pet April 16. Ord April 16.

**Moon, Henry,** Leeds, out of business. Dewsbury. Pet April 9. Ord April 16.

**Smith, Horace Melville,** Halifax, Solicitor. Halifax. Pet April 7. Ord April 16.

**Williams, George Frederick,** Newport, Monmouthshire, Publican. Newport (Mon). Pet April 9. Ord April 16.

**Woolmer, Henry,** High Barnet, Hertfordshire, Grocer. Barnet. Pet Mar 25. Ord April 16.

**Wyatt, James,** West Bromwich, Staffordshire, Greengrocer. Oldbury. Pet Apr 8. Ord Apr 10.

**Francouer, Thomas Louis,** Ball's Pond rd, St Luke's, Fancy Bracket Maker. High Court. Pet Feb 16. Ord Apr 16.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

TUESDAY, April 22, 1884.

**Abell, George Mutlow,** Cheltenham, Solicitor. Cheltenham. Pet April 19. Ord April 19. Exam May 16 at 12.

**Barnden, George John,** Brighton, Baker. Brighton. Pet April 18. Ord April 19. Exam May 8 at 12.

**Baxter, James,** Sutton in Ashfield, Nottinghamshire, General Dealer. Nottingham. Pet April 16. Ord April 16. Exam May 13.

**Brown, John Martin,** Cottingham, Northamptonshire, Farmer. Northampton. Pet Mar 29. Ord April 19. Exam May 21.

**Clark, John,** New Elee, Lincolnshire, Draper. Gt Grimsby. Pet April 17. Ord April 17. Exam May 8 at 12 at Townhall.

**Evans, David,** Machynlleth, Montgomeryshire, Tanner. Aberystwith. Pet April 17. Ord April 17. Exam May 1 at 10.

**Field, Harry,** Birmingham, Gent. Birmingham. Pet April 1. Ord April 10. Exam May 8.

**Ford, Thomas Rowland,** and William John Dover, Norwich, Shoe Manufacturers. Norwich. Pet April 18. Ord April 18. Exam May 21 at 12 at Shirehall, Norwich Castle.

**Gillard, Walter Bruce,** East Dulwich, Surrey, Commercial Traveller. High Court. Pet April 18. Ord April 18. Exam May 7 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.

**Green, Leeson,** Nottingham, Grocer. Nottingham. Pet April 16. Ord April 17. Exam May 13.

**Harley, Edward John,** Cardiff, Shipowner. Pet April 18. Ord April 18. Exam May 9 at 12.30.



Hook, Edward, Gt Yarmouth, Norfolk, Fish Merchant. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Apr 6. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 10 at 10.30 at Townhall, Gt Yarmouth.  
 Manning, John, Cheltenham, Haberdasher, Cheltenham. Pet Apr 18. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 16 at 12.  
 Moore, Henry William, Nottingham, Printer. Nottingham. Pet April 9. Ord Apr 17. Exam May 13.  
 Moore, William, Leicester, Tailor. Leicester. Pet Apr 15. Ord Apr 17. Exam May 7 at 10.  
 Rickinson, John, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Worcester. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17. Exam May 8 at 11.  
 Shepherd, Sarah, Barnsley, Saddler. Barnsley. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 17. Exam May 29 at 1.  
 Simister, Thomas, Hyde, Cheshire, Grocer. Ashton under Lyne. Pet Apr 18. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 1.  
 Southorn, Charles, Brighton, Upholsterer. Brighton. Pet Apr 19. Ord Apr 19. Exam May 8 at 12.  
 Tiley, Thomas John, Brighton, Tobaccoist. Brighton. Pet Apr 17. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 15.  
 Tirrell, Alfred John, Merton, Oxfordshire, Farmer. Oxford. Pet Mar 31. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 22 at 12.30.  
 Townsend, William, St Mary's Cray, Kent, Builder. Croydon. Pet Apr 4. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 9.  
 Williams, William, Nottingham, Solicitor. Nottingham. Pet Mar 25. Ord Apr 18. Exam May 13.  
 Wright, William Atkinson, Leeds, Spring Maker. Leeds. Pet April 18. Ord April 18. Exam April 23 at 11.  
 Yellop, Robert, Hoveton St John, Norfolk, Farmer. Norwich. Pet April 12. Ord April 17. Exam May 21 at 12 at Shirehall, Norwich Castle.  
 Dixon, William Henry, and Thomas Wilson, Sunderland, Steamship Managers. Sunderland. Pet Mar 26. Ord April 17. Exam May 15 at 2.30.

The following Amended Notices are substituted for that published in the London Gazette of the 11th of April, 1884.  
 Tittle, John Bennett, Bristol, Brewers' Agent. Bristol. Pet Mar 26. Ord April 7. Exam May 2 at 12.  
 Churchley, Job, Westbromwich, Staffordshire, Draper. Oldbury. Pet April 5. Ord April 16. Exam April 25.

The following Amended Notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of the 4th of April, 1884.  
 Hardwicke, J. B., Threadneedle st, Banker's Clerk. High Court. Order made under s. 103. Ord Mar 29. Exam May 2 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.

## FIRST MEETINGS.

Banks, Robert, Manchester, Photographer. April 29 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Oden's chhrs, Bridge st, Manchester.  
 Barnden, George John, Brighton, Baker. May 2 at 2. Official Receiver, 160, North st, Brighton.  
 Baxter, James, Sutton in Ashfield, Nottinghamshire, General Dealer. April 30 at 11. Official Receiver, Exchange walk, Nottingham.  
 Clark, John, New Cleo, Lincolnshire, Draper. April 29 at 11. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby.  
 Colledge, Joseph, Chicken, St Kilda's rd, Stoke Newington. May 5 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.  
 Davy, Joseph, Kingston upon Hull, Licensed Victualler. April 30 at 2. Hull Incorporated Law Society, Lincoln's inn bldgs, Bowalley lane, Hull.  
 Endacott, John Ellicombe, Stapleton, Gloucestershire, Licensed Victualler. May 1 at 12. Official Receiver, Bank chhrs, Bristol.  
 Field, Harry, Birmingham, Gentleman. April 29 at 12. Luke Jesson Sharp, Whitehall chhrs, Colmore row, Birmingham.  
 Figg, William, Ellesborough, Buckinghamshire, Farmer. May 7 at 11. County Court Office, Aylesbury.  
 Ford, Thomas Rowland, Sprowston, Norfolk, Shoe Manufacturer. May 1 at 4. Official Receiver, Queen st, Norwich.  
 Ford, Thomas Rowland, and William John Dover, Norwich, Shoe Manufacturers. May 1 at 3. Official Receiver, Queen st, Norwich.  
 Green, Leeson, Nottingham, Grocer. April 29 at 11. Official Receiver, Exchange walk, Nottingham.  
 Green, Morris, Sheffield, Table Blade Grinder. April 30 at 12. Official Receiver, Fig Tree lane, Sheffield.  
 Hare, Francis, Sheffield, Fish Salesman. April 30 at 1. Official Receiver, Fig Tree lane, Sheffield.  
 Hartley, W., Salford, Oil Manufacturer. April 30 at 2.30. Court House, Encombe pl, Salford.  
 Hook, Edward, Gt Yarmouth, Fish Merchant. April 30 at 3. Lovewell Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.  
 Jacobs, Marcus, Kingsland, Clothier. May 8 at 2. Bankruptcy Offices, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Jones, Edward, Torquay, Gent. April 30 at 11. Castle of Exeter, Exeter.  
 Kitching, Samuel William, Sheffield, Grocer. April 30 at 11. Official Receiver, Fig Tree lane, Sheffield.  
 Lee, John Widger, Topsham, Devonshire, Hotel Keeper. April 30 at 12. Castle of Exeter, Exeter.  
 Leech, Arthur, Newcastle under Lyne, Solicitor. April 30 at 3. North Stafford Station Hotel, Stoke upon Trent.  
 Mackintosh, Lachlan, and Herbert Lloyd Beauchamp, East Acton lane, East Acton, Merchants. May 9 at 12. Bankruptcy Offices, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Moore, William, Leicester, Tailor. May 2 at 3. Official Receiver, 28, Friar lane, Leicester.  
 Moore, William Henry, Nottingham, Printer. April 30 at 12. Official Receiver, Exchange walk, Nottingham.  
 Poxon, George, Gt Yarmouth, Bricklayer. April 30 at 2.30. Lovewell Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth.  
 Rickinson, John, Sharncliffe, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. May 1 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Worcester.  
 Simister, Thomas, Hyde, Cheshire, Grocer. May 2 at 2. Official Receiver, Townhall chhrs, Ashton under Lyne.  
 Smith, James Wilson, otherwise known as Charles Merion, Hanberk rd, Clapham Common, Theatrical Manager. May 1 at 3. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, S.W.  
 Smith, Joseph, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, Tailor. May 7 at 11. County Court Office, Aylesbury.  
 Smyth, Zachariah, Barnstable, Carriage Builder. April 30 at 3. 3, The Square, Barnstable.  
 Southorn, Charles, Brighton, Upholsterer. April 30 at 12. Official Receiver, 160, North st, Brighton.  
 Tiley, Thomas John, Brighton, Tobaccoist. May 1 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 160, North st, Brighton.  
 Williamson, John, Jan, confined in her Majesty's Prison at Coldbath Fields, Road Contractor. May 8 at 2. Bankruptcy Offices, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Wilson, Edward, Darlaston, Staffordshire, Draper. April 30 at 12. Official Receiver, Bridge st, Walsall.  
 Wilson, John, Gascoyne rd, South Hackney, Ship Owner. May 9 at 2. Bankruptcy Offices, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Wright, William Atkinson, Leeds, Spring Maker. May 2 at 11. Official Receiver, St Andrew's chhrs, 22, Park row, Leeds.  
 Yellop, Robert, Hoveton St John, Norfolk, Farmer. May 1 at 1. Official Receiver, Queen st, Norwich.  
 The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London

Gazette of the 15th of April, 1884.

Lovatt, Thomas James, Michael Francis Egan, and Antoine Cornelius Van Meesteren, Birmingham, Provision Merchants. May 2 at 11. Luke Jesson Sharp, Whitehall chhrs, Colmore row, Birmingham.

## ADJUDICATIONS.

Abell, George Mutlow, Cheltenham, Solicitor. Cheltenham. Pet April 10. Ord April 19.  
 Benjamin, Abbott, Gt Grimsby, Lincolnshire, Milk Dealer. Gt Grimsby. Pet April 5. Ord April 17.  
 Auscombe, Joseph Allen, Penge, Painter. Croydon. Pet March 30. Ord April 19.  
 Atherton, John, Chorley, Lancaster, Coal Merchant. Bolton. Pet April 6. Ord April 19.  
 Bowen, James, Sunderland, Draper. Sunderland. Pet March 27. Ord April 18.  
 Cheahir, William, Litchfield rd, Cricklewood, Builder. Barnet. Pet Feb 15. Ord April 18.  
 Coe, Frederick William, Stowmarket, Suffolk, Grocer. Bury St Edmunds. Pet Mar 12. Ord Apr 17.  
 Cooke, Harry, Norwich, Bootmaker. Norwich. Pet April 2. Ord April 17.  
 Croft, Thomas, Seacombe, Manure Maker. Birkenhead. Pet March 31. Ord Apr 16.  
 Gillard, Walter Bruce, East Dulwich, Commercial Traveller. High Court. Pet Apr 18. Ord Apr 18.  
 Hart, Edward William, Hertford, out of business. Hertford. Pet Mar 29. Ord April 19.  
 Hewison, Alfred Edward, New Cleo, Lincolnshire, Fish Merchant. Gt Grimsby. Pet Mar 29. Ord Apr 17.  
 Hood, James, Broadstairs, Jeweller. Canterbury. Pet Mar 22. Ord Apr 19.  
 Howarth, John, Heywood, Lancashire, Commission Agent. Bolton. Pet Apr 18. Ord April 19.  
 Jarvis, Adams, Old Brentford, Corn Dealer. Brentford. Pet April 1. Ord Apr 9.  
 Jones, Richard, Madeley, Shropshire, Grocer. Madeley. Pet March 27. Ord Apr 16.  
 Jones, William, Liverpool, Poulterer. Liverpool. Pet March 30. Ord April 17.  
 Leage, Martin Charles, Swansea, Bootmaker. Swansea. Pet March 28. Ord April 17.  
 Manning, Frederic, Worcester, Jeweller. Worcester. Pet March 28. Ord April 19.  
 Millson, Frederick, Southampton, Licensed Victualler. Southampton. Pet March 22. Ord April 18.  
 Moore, Jonathan, Elm grove, Liscard, Nurseryman. Birkenhead. Pet Feb 25. Ord March 24.  
 Munday, James, Newton Valence, Hampshire, Farmer. Winchester. Pet March 28. Ord April 16.  
 Parry, Robert, Hurstpierpoint, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Brighton. Pet April 15. Ord April 17.  
 Rawson, Edwin Thomas, New Brighton, Builder. Birkenhead. Pet March 19. Ord April 5.  
 Richardson, John, Quorndon, Leicestershire, Butcher. Leicester. Pet March 28. Ord April 17.  
 Tirrell, Alfred John, Merton, Oxfordshire, Farmer. Oxford. Pet March 31. Ord April 16.  
 Tittle, John, Bennett, Bristol, Brewers' Agent. Bristol. Pet March 26. Ord April 19.  
 Varty, Calvert, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Grocer. Birkenhead. Pet March 29. Ord April 10.  
 Watts, John, Newark upon Trent, Shoemaker. Nottingham. Pet March 27. Ord April 17.  
 Whitaker, Frederick, Coleman st, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet March 10. Ord April 18.  
 Williams, Michael, Fish st hill, Asphalte Importer. High Court. Pet March 7. Ord April 17.  
 Wingate, David, Gloucester, Builder. Gloucester. Pet March 15. Ord April 19.  
 Wood, Frank junr., Storrington, Sussex, no business. Brighton. Pet March 4. Ord April 17.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 28s; Country, 28s; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	451	In re Munns and Longden .....	457
CONCERNING ESCROWS .....	453	SOLICITORS' CASES .....	456
REVIEWS .....	454	SOCIETIES .....	458
CORRESPONDENCE .....	455	COURT FEES .....	459
THE NEW PRACTICE .....	456	LEGAL APPOINTMENTS .....	460
Whitham v. Whitham .....	456	LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK .....	460
BANKRUPTCY CASES .....	456	LEGAL NEWS .....	461
CASES OF THE WEEK:—		COURT PAPERS .....	461
In re The Dominion of Canada	457	COMPANIES .....	463
Plumbago Company .....	457	LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c. ....	463
Howarth v. Howarth .....	457		

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All communications intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

\* \* \* The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, as only a small number of copies remain on hand.

**SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,**

Arti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &amp;c., and in reality creates than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA &amp; LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &amp;c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors, H. SCHWEITZER &amp; Co., 10 Adam-st., Strand, London, W.

**THE NEW PRACTICE DECISIONS.**

Fifth Edition (with Supplement, containing the New Rules, Orders, and Decisions to March, 1884), now ready, crown 8vo, cloth (1,170 pages), price 15s.

**BAXTER'S JUDICATURE ACTS** and **RULES.** BY WYNNE E. BAXTER, Solicitor, Coroner for Sussex, and late Under-Sheriff of London and Middlesex. The Fifth Edition, with Supplement, is now ready, price 15s., crown 8vo, cloth (1,170 pages).

\* \* The Supplement, containing the New Rules, Orders, and Decisions to March, 1884, may be had separately, price 6s.

London: BUTTERWORTHS, 7, Fleet-street, Her Majesty's Law Publishers.

**LAW.**—A Solicitor of considerable and varied experience (admitted 1879), who is energetic, expeditious, and of business habits, and who has had first-rate experience in Conveyancing and Chancery matters in offices of high standing in Lincoln's-inn and the City, and who is now with a first-rate West-end firm, engaged in Chancery, Conveyancing, and General Practice, desires a Conveyancing and Chancery Managing Clerkship in a high-class London Office; unexceptionable testimonials as to character, ability, &c.—Address, E. E., care of Clements & Son, Law Stationers, 22, Chancery-lane.**LAW.**—Managing Clerkship, with a view to Partnership. Wanted by a Gentleman; fair Conveyancer, well up in County Court, Succession, and Residuary work. Slight advocacy.—Address, S., "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.**LAW.**—Solicitor (Prizeman 1881) employed constantly since and admitted, seeks Conveyancing or Conveyancing and Assistant General Clerkship in a good firm. London. West of England preferred.—C. L., "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.**LAW.**—Conveyancing and General Clerk (20) Seeks Engagement; nearly five years in present situation; shorthand; unexceptionable references.—J. C. W., 30, Birkby-terrace, Huddersfield.**LAW.**—A Medical Man wishes to Place his Son (who has just passed the Finals) in an Office where by hard work future promotion will follow; present salary not an object.—Apply to P. R., care of Mr. Stanley Robinson, 11, Poultry, E.C.**LAW.**—A proficient Shorthand Clerk Seeks Re-engagement, Conveyancing under supervision; salary moderate; highest references.—Address, T. W. GINN, 64, Saint Andrew's-street, Cambridge.**A GREAT SAVING to SOLICITORS and SURVEYORS** in Office Expenses can be effected by purchasing their **STATIONERY and ACCOUNT BOOKS** at F. CORSE'S Law and General Stationery Warehouse, Bedford-row House, Theobald's-road, London. Judicature Foolscap (full weight guaranteed), ruled for Affidavits or Costs, equal to that usually sold at 2½s. per ream, 15s. 6d. per ream. Other qualities kept in stock. Brief Paper, 14s., 16s., 18s. 6d., and 18s. per ream. Barnard's Hand-made Brief, 36s. per ream. Letter Copying Books (eight qualities kept) at wholesale prices. Deeds Engrossed and Writings Copied. Statements of Claim and Defence, Affidavits, and every description of Law Printing expeditiously and correctly done.—Send for Price List and Samples to F. CORSE, Bedford-row House, London, W.C.**UNIVERSITIES, Civil Service, Legal, and Medical Preliminary, and other Examinations.** Pupils from fourteen years of age prepared by a Tutor and Public Examiner of nineteen years' experience; late Fellow of his College.—Rev. W. H. ROWLANDSON, M.A., Great Braxted Rectory, Witham, Essex.**ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE.**—Cause Lists, Judges' Chambers Summons Lists, and all printed Official Papers may be had either separately or by subscription at Room 9, Temple Bar entrance.**EDD AND SON,****ROBE MAKERS,**

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London &amp;c.

**ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.****SOLICITORS' GOWNS**

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace

**CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS**

ESTABLISHED 1808.

**94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON****NATIONAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY****FOR MUTUAL ASSURANCE,****2, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.**

Established 1830.

**MODERATE PREMIUMS. LARGE PROFITS. UNDOUBTED SECURITY.**

Military and Naval Officers assured at moderate fixed premiums covering all risk of Service at Home and Abroad.

Claims paid 30 days after admission.

Further information may be obtained on application to

**HENRY JOHN PUCKLE, Secretary.****LAW FIRE INSURANCE OFFICE, 114,**Chancery-lane, London, April 24, 1884.—Notice is hereby Given that the **ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING** of the Shareholders of the Law Fire Insurance Society will be held at the Society's Office, Chancery-lane on Tuesday, the 6th day of May next, to Elect Seven Directors, in the room of the like number of Directors who go out by rotation, and also to Elect Three Auditors, in the room of the like number who retire, and for General Purposes.

And that an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Shareholders will likewise be held at the place aforesaid, for the Election of Two Directors, in the room of Francis Thomas Bircham, Esq., and Thomas William Budd, Esq., deceased; also for the Election of an Auditor, in the room of Frederick Morgan, Esq., who has resigned this office. The business of the said Extraordinary Meeting to take place immediately after the termination of the business of the Annual General Meeting.

The following Directors going out by rotation are eligible and offer themselves for re-election:—

William Thomas Carlisle, Esq., Bartle John Laurie Frere, Esq., George Rooper, Esq., Charles Norris Wilde, Esq., John Moxon Clabon, Esq., Frederick Peake, Esq., Arnold William White, Esq.

The Auditors retiring are—Edward Francis Bigg, Esq., Octavius Leefe, Esq., William Tanner Neve, Esq.

They are eligible and offer themselves for re-election. The Candidates for the vacant seats at the Board are William Coppard Beaumont, Frederick John Blake, Thomas Dolling Bolton, Frederick Morgan, and Spencer Croughton Wilde, Esquires.

The candidate for the vacant Auditorship is Edward Hugh Whitehead, Esq.

The Chair will be taken at One o'clock precisely.—By order of the Board of Directors.

**GEORGE WILLIAM BELL, Secretary.****LAW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.** Chief Office—128 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

The Funds in hand and Capital Subscribed amount to upwards of £1,700,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUPDOR, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Middle Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee &amp; Pemberton), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

The Directors invite attention to the New Form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

Policies of Insurance granted against the contingency of Issue at moderate rates of Premium.

The Company ADVANCES Money on Mortgage of Life Interests and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

The Company also purchases Reversions, giving the vendor the option of re-purchase within a limited period, whether the tenant for life be living or not.

Prospectuses, copies of the Directors' Reports and Annual Balance Sheet, and every information, sent post-free on application to

**FRANK McGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.****LIFE ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND:**

(For Life Assurance and Annuities.)

**FUNDS**... £2,740,000  
**ANNUAL REVENUE**... £200,000  
**LOANS** made on Freeholds, Leaseholds, and other Securities, including Life Interests, and Absolute or Contingent Reversions. Loans upon Reversions are made at annual interest, or in consideration of a deferred charge.

London: 5, Lombard-street, and 123, Pall Mall; Edinburgh: 82, Princes-street.

**NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY.**Established 1836.  
**FIRE AND LIFE. AT HOME AND ABROAD**  
London: 1, Moorgate-street, E.C. ASSURANCE, & King-street.**INCOME & FUNDS (1883)**  
Fire Premiums... £400,100  
Life Premiums... 181,500  
Interest... 151,800  
Accumulated Funds... £2,740,000**CLERICAL, MEDICAL, and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.**

13, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.

Chairman, Rt. Hon. Sir J. R. MOWBRAY, Bt., M.P., D.O.L.  
Annual Income... £256,000  
Assurance Fund... £2,451,000Established 1847, for the assurance of Healthy and Invalid lives.  
New and liberal conditions of assurance (see new Prospectus).B. NEWBATT, Actuary and Secretary.  
N.B.—The usual Commission allowed to Solicitors.**LONDON ASSURANCE CORPORATION.**Established by Royal Charter, A.D. 1720.  
No. 7, Royal Exchange, E.C., and 25, Parliament-street, S.W.Marine, Fire, and Life Assurances have been granted by the Corporation for more than a century and a half.  
Funds in hand exceed £3,300,000.**REVERSIONARY and LIFE INTERESTS** IN LANDED or FUNDED PROPERTY or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED, or Loans or Annuities thereon granted, by the **EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY (LIMITED)**, of Lancaster-place, Waterloo Bridge, Strand. Established 1835. Capital, £500,000. Interest on Loans may be capitalized.F. S. CLAYTON, Joint Secretary.  
C. H. CLAYTON, Secretaries.**THE COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY—FIRE, LIFE, MARINE.**Capital fully subscribed... £2,500,000  
Capital paid-up... 250,000  
Life Fund in Special Trust for Life Policy-holders exceeds... 812,000  
Other Funds exors d... 1,000,000  
TOTAL INVESTED FUNDS UPWARDS OF TWO MILLIONSTotal Annual Premium Income exceeds... 1,005,000  
OFFICE: 19 AND 20, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.  
WEST END OFFICE: 6, PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.**ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL SCHOOL,**Hyde Park Corner, S.W.—The Summer Session will commence on Thursday, May 1st. The Examination for the *William Brown Exhibition*, £100 per annum, tenable for two years, will be held in July.Prospectus and full information may be obtained from  
WILLIAM WADHAM, M.D., Dean of the School.**CAVENDISH COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.**

Four Scholarships of £30 each, tenable for 3 years, given, one by the Clothworkers' Company, one by His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G., one by Samuel Morley, Esq., M.P., and one by E. B. Foster, Esq., will be offered for competition on August 6, 7, and 8, 1884. Candidates must be under 17 on August 1st. The usual age of entry being between 16 and 17, a Degree may be taken at 19.

The College Charges for Lodging, Board (with an extra Term in the Long Vacation), and including all necessary expenses of Tuition and University Fees, are £84 per annum.

For further information apply to the WARDEN, Cavendish College, Cambridge.

**FURNISH your HOUSES or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S FIRE SYSTEM.**The original, best, and most liberal. Founded A.D. 1808.  
Cash prices. No extra charge for time given. Illustrated price Catalogues, with full particulars of terms, post-free.

F. MOEDER, 243, 240, and 250, Tottenham-court-road, and 19, 20, and 21, Morwell-street, W. Established 1822.

**TO SOLICITORS and Others.—Loft**

and Well-lighted Offices and Chambers to be Let at Lansdale Chambers, No. 97, Chancery-lane (opposite the New Law Courts).—Apply to Messrs. LAUDRY &amp; Co., Chartered Accountants, on the premises.



## TLAND:

23,740,000  
2470,400  
and other  
bsolute or  
ersions are  
ation of a

H Mail;

## MPANT.

ROAD  
MEN: A.

0,100  
1,500  
1,900  
22,740,400

## NEEAL

W.

P.D.C.L.

6,000  
1,000  
healthy and

(see new

ecretary.  
olictors.

## ATION.

20.

ave been  
a century

## INTE.

PROPERTY

or Loans

BLE RE-

TED), 10,

established

a may be

oint

rstaries.

## SSUR-

RINE.

2,500,000

250,000

612,000

,001,000

OF TWO

,065,000

DON, E.C.

N. S. W.

## DICAL

The Sum-

May 1st.

e held in

obtained

School.

## HIDGE.

3 years.

e by His

Samuel

r. Esq.,

and 8,

6,

and 17, a

with an

ling all

y Fees.

ARDON,

## ART-

en.

dars of

court-

Estab-

Lofty

to be

y-lane

cears.

n the